DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 025 SO 020 975

AUTHOR Hoachlander, Marjorie E.
TITLE Profile of a Museum Registrar: CASE Research Project 7-78.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.; Cooper-Hewitt Museum, Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Design, New York, NY.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 125p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academy for Educational Development, 1414 Twenty-Second Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; *Museums; Occupational Surveys; *Personnel Data; Profiles; Questionnaires; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS Museum Registrars; Museum Studies

ABSTRACT

This book represents the first independent research study directed toward the educational needs and interests of museum registrars to be undertaken by a university in collaboration with a nationally recognized museum. The study's primary objective was to provide data to be used for the development of materials and methods in the training and education of museum registrars. Designed to encourage museum registrars to express how they view themselves in relation to their work was mailed to 434 museum registrars in the United States and Canada. In addition, 100 museum directors were surveyed on how they perceive the role of the registrar. Other components of the research design of the project included the production of color videotapes based on study topics selected by the registrars. An annotated bibliography also was compiled by members of the advisement group for the project. Based on the findings of the research, the following five recommendations were made: (1) more research should be undertaken on museum training; (2) a larger quantity of training materials more relevant to the needs of museums should be created; (3) study centers for museum professionals should be established; (4) more technical assistance should be obtained by museums; and (5) the use of color videotape for operational purposes in museums should be explored. Appendices include: (1) the survey instrument; (2) a computerized profile of a museum registrar; (3) data on functions performed by museum registrars; (4) interview questions; and (5) the script of a videotape on the job-related tasks of a museum registrar entitled "When the Show Moves On." Tables, figures, and a partially annotated bibliography of general reference books, books on automation, computerization, conservation, and museum registration, and periodicals are included. (DB)

SO 020 975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARJORIE WEBSTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# PROFILE OF A MUSEUM REGISTRAR

CASE Research Project 07-78

Marjorie E. Hoachlander, Ph.D.

A research project of

The Center for Advanced Study in Education
Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

conducted in collaboration with

Cooper-Hewitt, The Smithsonian Institution's
National Museum of Design, New York

Academy for Educational Development
Washington, D.C.
July 1979

Additional copies of this publication may be ordered prepaid ($3.00 per copy) by writing to Academy for Educational Development, 1414 Twenty-Second Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Foreword in Three Parts | i |
| Acknowledgments | v |
| Part I: A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW OF MUSEUM TRAINING | 1 |
| Part II: RATIONALE FOR STUDY | 7 |
| Part III: OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT | 11 |
| Research Design: Five Components | 11 |
| Part IV: OUTCOMES: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION | 13 |
| How Museum Registrars View Themselves in Relation to Their Work | 13 |
| From Museum Directors: A Composite View of the Registrar | 25 |
| A Pilot Videotape on Packing and Shipping | 33 |
| A Five-Way Comparison of Media Techniques for Condition Reporting | 37 |
| An Annotated Bibliography for Registrars by Registrars | 42 |
| Part V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 43 |
| Part VI: RECOMMENDATIONS | 49 |
| Part VII: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY | 55 |
| Advisement Groups | 69 |
| Reference Notes | 73 |
| APPENDIX A: | |
| Facsimile of Survey Booklet | 83 |
| Tables 1 through 9: Computerized Profile of A Museum Registrar | 93 |
| Table 10: Functions Performed by Museum Registrars By Frequency of Activity and Type of Museum | 98 |
| APPENDIX B: | |
| Protocol for Interview of Museum Directors | 105 |
| APPENDIX C: | |
| Afterscript of Videotape, *When the Show Moves On* | 109 |

# TABLES


1. Cross Table of Age by Sex of Museum Registrars ..... 93
2. Forms of Media in Previous Educational Experience..... 93
3. How Registrars Received Formal Training in Museum Work ..... 94
4. Previous Employment by Type ..... 94
5. Selected Topics for Study in order of Preference by Mode ..... 95
6. Selected Topics for Study in Order of Preference by Percentage ..... 95
7. Preference for Forms of Media Study by Study Topic and Frequency of Mention ..... 96
8. Preference for Types of Training Program by Percentage ..... 97
9. Preference for Coursework in Training Programs by Percentages..... 97
10. Functions Performed by Museum Registrars By Frequency of Activity and Type of Museum..... 98


# FIGURES


1. Profile by Computer of Registrarial Functions Performed in Museums of All Types..... 20
2. Schema for Comparison of Photographic Techniques for Condition Reporting ..... 41

# FOREWORD IN THREE PARTS

For decades, education's challenge has been to provide a realistic preparation for the world of work. For some years, this has been met by ensuring basic mastery of "the three R's". All other skills were acquired "on the job".

Today, however, education is under unprecedented pressures exerted by a highly complex, specialized society in which an informed population is expressing strong interest in lifelong learning, educational accountability and job satisfaction. These factors present themselves at a time when a overburdened economy is heightening our concerns about employee productivity, rising costs and unemployment. More than ever before, educators and employers must respond to both the basic and specialized needs of the labor market.

As an example of the extensive training required by a specific career and of the resources needed to supply this training, the Academy for Educational Development is pleased to publish *Profile of a Museum Registrar*. It is hoped that this volume will serve not only to outline the educational needs of professional museum personnel but also to enhance the quality of learning in general by illustrating a successful collaboration between the worlds of education and work.

The Academy is grateful to the William H. Donner Foundation for its support of this publication of a report on research done by the Center for Advanced Study in Education of the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York and by Cooper Hewitt, The Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Design. The five study components herein are recommended to all who are interested in museum work and continuing education.

Alvin C. Eurich
President
Academy for Educational
Development

The Center for Advanced Study in Education (CASE), a component of the Graduate School and University Center of CUNY, has as one of its functions the task of bringing the academic world closer to the practical world. Because CASE has access to the entire academic community within the Graduate School, it has sought to be involved with as many education-related institutions as possible. One such institution is the museum.

CASE should be able to assist museums to better understand methods of teaching, styles of learning, and research methodology in relation to the advancement of professional staff. Evaluation of programs, staff selection and training, communication among personnel and with the public, needs and interests of museum clientele are typical research problems on which museums and universities could and should work together.

Dr. Hoachlander's study of museum registrars is an example of such an enterprise. Among the results of her study is the recognition of the registrars' contribution to the successful operation of museums. Her survey clearly identifies the registrars' needs and aspirations as well as spells out specific recommendations for their professional growth.

Dr. Hoachlander has shown the importance of bringing together university and museum people in a way which moves toward a greater and improved educational role for museums in their communities. The present report provides us with a significant step toward the goal of complete cooperation.

Max Weiner, Ph.D.
Acting Dean of Research
and University Programs

Since its foundation as the Cooper Union Museum at the doorstep of the 20th century, the Cooper-Hewitt Museum has served as a working laboratory for scholars, students and designers. Indeed, the Museum as a research center and resource for study was pre-eminent in its philosophy, taking precedence over all other considerations in its formative days. Collections were acquired with the idea that confrontation with the objects themselves rather than pictorial reproduction was a necessity to people training in design, just as the laboratory biologist must deal with first-hand natural materials in preference to texts and diagrams. With such an historical mandate, the Museum's collaboration with Dr. Marjorie Hoachlander's project seemed natural.

Participation in this research program was particularly appealing because the Museum's collections seemed ideal for evaluating a registrar's functions: over 300,000 objects ranging in size from tiny to large, in value from very little to priceless, of unlimited diversity of function and material. The collections offer a registrar a range of experience much more widely applicable than those of museums whose holdings are of a more restricted nature.

The registrar occupies an extremely important role in any museum, although functions vary in each. The Cooper-Hewitt registrar's responsibility is broad, dealing with the details of an active program of exhibitions, frequent loans to other institutions and the day to day maintenance of collection records. Along with the usual recording, Dr. Marjorie Hoachlander has helped to define this essential professional function.

The education of museum professionals will always be of interest to the Cooper-Hewitt Museum. Staff members are urged to make use of programs such as this to broaden their own experience. Working in cooperation with schools and universities in developing educational programs has always been a particular interest, and will increasingly be so. The anticipated development of this pilot project into the

organization of a new Study Center for Museum Professionals is seen as a means of developing further links between the museum and the academic world.

Lisa Taylor
Director
Cooper-Hewitt Museum, The Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Design

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To accomplish this study required diverse patterns of collaboration never before attempted. Many persons from the museum profession and academic community were called upon to participate or give advice. All were concerned with advancing professionalism among museum staff through new approaches to education at the mid-career level. Each has contributed to the body of knowledge or record of experience represented by this report.

Throughout the research process, Elizabeth Burnham, Registrar for Cooper-Hewitt, The Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Design, acted as Registrar Associate to the project. She provided invaluable perspective on daily, realistic aspects of a museum registrar's work, while at the same time being available for coordination of videotape productions and tabulation of data.

Marsha Green, Research Associate, responsibly carried out computational procedures required for analysis of data, translating statistical results to the tables shown in this report.

Arlene Vogl, Project Assistant, and Laurene Banks, Secretary, facilitated administration of project activities with enthusiasm and genuine interest.

Stefan Moore and Claude Beller, TVG Productions, gave freely of their creative talents for the production of a pilot videotape.

John Haney, Director of the Center for Instructional Development, Queens College, and his staff lent their full expertise to a five-way comparison of media techniques for condition reporting.

Advisement on an individual basis was found to be essential to realizing our objectives through an independent research effort. During various periods of study, two groups of museum registrars served. Many evaluated portions of this work and supported the project staff intellectually or emotionally, according to need. I am indebted to them for what I have learned.

It was especially helpful to call upon museum directors for advice on administrative problems and ethical considerations. During telephone conversations and personal visits, they were generous with their thoughts as well as their time.

To each adviser I extend my sincere appreciation.*

Endorsement of the project by the American Association of Museums (AAM) was most welcome. The pilot survey conducted during the 1977 meeting at Seattle was thoughtfully arranged by Jane North, Conference Coordinator, and members of the Registrars Committee. Joseph Noble, President of the AAM during the course of project activity, and Richard B.K. McLanathan, then Executive Director, frequently responded to my requests for assistance with resourceful comment.

Concurrent efforts toward studying approaches to professional training within the Canadian Museums Association led to helpful discussions with Robin Inglis, Executive Director, and Lynne Teather,

Research Associate. I wish to acknowledge their cooperation in sharing materials and findings with me.

Continual encouragement from Harold Proshansky, President, Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York, Max Weiner, Director of The Center for Advanced Study in Education, and Lisa Taylor, Director of Cooper-Hewitt Museum, proved to be a mainstay during critical periods of implementation. Their cohesive view of the purpose behind this project has demonstrated the importance of having broadly representative yet strongly committed institutional support behind a large-scale effort of this nature.

I am grateful that this research has been supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, The William H. Donner Foundation, with additional funds from Allied Van Lines and Huntington T. Block Insurance. John Spencer, former Director of Museum Programs for the Endowment, and Philip Jessup, former Executive Director for the Donner Foundation, are to be commended for their contributions of sound judgment and practical advice during the course of this project.

It was fortunate to learn about the interest of the Academy for Educational Development (AED) in the training needs of museum personnel. Through an additional grant from the William H. Donner Foundation, I have benefited greatly from working with William Kinder, Program Officer for the AED, on this publication and look forward to a further association with the Academy in related museum projects.

For preparation of the manuscript, I was ably assisted by Diane Eves, copy editor, Judith Irwin, technical assistant, Miriam Martin and Toni Crate, typists.

To the registrars and directors whose responses provide much of the information provided in this report, I give special thanks.

Marjorie E. Hoachlander, Ph.D.
Project Director

July 1979

*Please refer to individual listing of Advisement Groups on page 69.

# I

# A Retrospective View of Museum Training

> Why is it . . . that the museum profession is not taken more seriously? . . . I hope that the governing boards of museums will begin to realize, and soon, that the head of their institution should be a *trained professional* — two words that describe qualities of greater importance than any more flashy credentials.
>
> S. Dillon Ripley
> Secretary
> The Smithsonian Institution
> May 1978[1]

In context, Ripley's comments obviously were made with reference to the widely criticized selection by the Metropolitan Museum of Art of a candidate for one of its top-level professional appointments.[2] This decision involved the choice of an administrator highly proficient in business procedures and governmental relations over another whose qualifications reflected what might be called "the museum tradition" — formal study, practiced connoisseurship and long-term exposure to the visual arts. As we now know, both candidates were retained through a shift in policy and staff organization, a solution that has yet to be tested fully for its effect.[3]

Within a broader frame of reference, Secretary Ripley's question is very much to the point with respect to the need for better training of museum personnel, for greater recognition that there is, indeed, a museum profession and for raising the general level of professionalism within it. His remarks also provide an appropriate backdrop for presenting information on circumstances and research efforts that preceded as well as influenced the study to be reported in subsequent pages.

Today, according to listings of the Institute of Museum Services, there are more than 6,000 museums in the United States. Although many of these are small and have only limited functions, museums collectively employ an estimated 10,000 people.[4] Museums are growing in number and, as shown by their attendance records, are attracting an ever-expanding audience.

Growing public pressures for services coupled with shrinking financial resources have made the demands on museums to raise the levels of professionalism and accountability more exacting than ever before. Yet, for almost a decade,[5] museum personnel, educators, and many other interested groups have attempted, with too little success, to better define and structure the museum profession,[6] develop a body of particularized knowledge and skills appropriate to it,[7] and establish standards for training programs suitable to its needs.[8]

Why has it taken so long to progress so moderately in formalizing the museum profession? The reasons are not entirely clear, but they are, indeed, complex.

Parochialism within museums, some say, is the major reason. Scholarly disdain for "museology" or similar forms of training in museum practices is blamed by others, including many museum personnel. Whatever the reason, the fact is that there has been a long-standing gap in agreement between museums and universities as to how they might interact productively toward developing a systematic, nationally recognized approach toward career education for museum employees.[9]

Early on, two successive listings of available training programs compiled by an investigative director of a university museum, G. Ellis Burcaw, showed that, despite an increasing number of course entries, what was being offered at that time ranged widely from the established to the tentative, from worthy to superficial, with scarcely any programs being directed toward people actively employed in museums.[10] While Burcaw's work was not intended to be of an evaluative nature, but rather a catalogue of sources, he took care to make these remarks:[11]

> Listing the offering of a museum or school is not to be taken as an endorsement either by the American Association of Museums or by the author. As yet, there is no certification of museum workers or of museum training courses and programs by the profession except for the diploma course of the Canadian Museums Association. As such avowed training proliferates, however, it becomes obvious that such certification is needed . . . A few years ago the term "museology" was seldom heard, and museum training opportunities were rare. . . New programs are appearing at a seemingly alarming rate, and an ever-increasing number of them are supported by public funds. We would suggest that the national professional museum organizations in the United States and Canada must soon consider whether codification, standardization and accreditation of museum training might not be in order.

Burcaw's publications stimulated further disclosure that many courses were being hastily organized in the face of newly available funding from the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Museum Act.[12] In fact, a few courses had not actually been presented because of some institutions' failure to obtain grant support or because there was insufficient interest shown in museum training within a particular geographical area. Organizational zeal was abundant, whereas collective preparation of standards for professional training was practically nonexistent at the outset of the 1970s.[13]

Burcaw felt strongly that colleges and universities should be responsible for much of the museum training that would be required, giving the unarguable reason that it is the business of these institutions to educate. He brought attention to the fact that in 1969 no more than sixty institutions of higher learning were actively engaged in museum training.[14] Nor were campus museums any more directly involved. Their "evasive genius" in avoiding a vanguard position for the education of museum workers, especially members of minority groups, was critically noted at an annual meeting of the American Association of

Museums (AAM).[15] It appeared that while the museum profession desired strongly to have a major role in the teaching/learning process on behalf of personnel, it was looking with chiding eye toward the academic community not only to initiate programs but also to provide traditionally acceptable settings for them.

There resulted within subsequent conferences an ongoing discourse which revealed crucial dichotomies of practical and scholarly education, administrative and curatorial expertise, museum and university control. These are best illustrated by selected comments of participants as follow:[16]

- Most top administrative jobs in museums are filled by people who came through the curatorial route which does not provide enough administrative experience. There should be more on every level. I am against professional administrators and feel that knowledge of the subject for museum people is primary.
- The distinction between the curator and museum man has led to acrimony. The divergence is artificial. We need all the strengths on both sides to benefit everyone. We need basic scholarly training, otherwise the basic idea of a museum as an historical inheritance is defeated.
- Museum training needs to be designed by people who work in museums and have experience in museums. It seems obvious that this is the way it should be. However, the initiative for many programs these days comes from the academy. They put up the money and approach museums, and they are degree-granting institutions . . . I admire the universities, but the fact is that many of these people regard "vocational" programs with contempt, and museum training programs should not be handicapped.
- There is no universal agreement that all museum work is object centered. Administration, for instance, is not.

Difference of opinion about what kinds of persons are needed to work in museums widened as groups gathered to give more pragmatic consideration to how training programs were to be created and administered. Reservations emerged concerning the capability of university faculty to develop curriculum that would take into full account the technical aspects of content required for the refinement of skills in museum practice and at the same time give students academic credit for their participation.

There was, however, broad agreement among museum professionals and educators that having at least an academic degree at the baccalaureate level would be necessary before anyone would be accepted for museum training, whether already employed in the museum or not. Efforts on the part of some to gain acceptance of associate degree programs at the community college level, particularly for training members of ethnic groups desiring to interpret their various cultures through museum activity, was, for the most part, futile.[17] There was simply too much to be resolved at traditional museum staff levels. It remains unclear why it has been so difficult to arrive at a defined path for professional development.

A number of concrete factors pertaining then as well as now can be more readily acknowledged. The museum profession has grown

through the years without benefit of rational planning. Museum functions, as technical and procedural as many are, have evolved during increasing demands of a most unpredictable nature, supported by public and/or private funds that have proven often to be insufficient in keeping with the pace of activity or intensity of goals. What has needed to be done in each museum simply has been done by available staff, usually with little opportunity to structure functions in a logical manner or, for that matter, to share precise methods with other museums facing similar problems. For many small museums, the diversity of functions falls to only a handful of people — oftentimes to one person.

Since there have not existed well-defined disciplines for careers in museum work, many people working in this field today are former volunteers who became involved because this type of employment was appealing to them. In fact, museum work continues to attract a great many individuals regardless of how well or how poorly their academic qualifications or career preparation may be suited to it.

Furthermore, museum personnel are promoted or otherwise thrust into positions, often with substantial management responsibility, for which they were never trained. They may have been schooled in disciplines related to a museum's collections but not necessarily in museum operations and administration. As museums have become more widely engaged in collections management, various operations have, of necessity, become more specialized, calling for higher levels of technical and administrative ability as well as knowledge. As in many other service-oriented professions, situational factors are creating a critical need for more purposive training of personnel.

For some time very little has been done to study museum functions, and, as a result, not enough is known about the training and educational requirements for various staff roles at the mid-career level which would expedite advancement of the museum profession. The chasm that has existed between museums and educational institutions may have perpetuated the problem longer than otherwise might have been the case. Repeated attempts to establish productive debate among representatives of the two groups appears to have begun to wear down the communications barriers. Although this trend may mark the beginning of a more collaborative period, much work remains to be done before significant progress can be demonstrated.

In recent years a major attempt was made toward supplementing the few fragmentary statistical studies on museums.[18] In many ways, it contributed a new dynamic to further investigation of museum studies programs.

**Museums USA, 1972 — 1975**

In pressing for a more focused effort toward understanding the diverse and complex makeup of museums, a nationwide survey of directors was conducted by the National Center for the Arts under contract with the National Endowment for the Arts. Suitably described by the Chairman of the Council, Nancy Hanks, as a "benchmark

study," its three-volume report presented the first comprehensive picture of these institutions — their numbers and locations, their types and functions, their facilities and finance, their personnel and trustees, their activities and attendance. Using a full array of computer programs, the study "went behind the display cases into the workings of a museum," brought forth information heretofore unknown and, in effect, introduced many different types of museums throughout the United States to each other's distinctions and similarities.[19]

The extensive data gathered by *Museums USA* was not intended to investigate specific training programs created by museums and universities. What information was elicited had more to do with their joint programs benefiting the community, rather than their own personnel. However, an important finding on museum studies is that *in only one in four of the museums with joint programs of any kind (24%) was there a training program for museum workers.* When viewed computationally on a national scale, collaborative effort toward advancing museum professionalism was found to be minimal.[20]

Although the emphasis of examination was primarily upon directors and secondarily upon overall museum operations, *Museums USA* stimulated an early curiosity about the status and function of a registrar within the organizational structure of a museum.

In this study, the placement of the registrar within five selected categories of museum operations was imprecise and, perhaps, somewhat anachronistic. This staff member was listed under the job category of Administration, with no inclusion under Curatorial (Display/Exhibition).[21]

To have listed the registrar in both categories would have, of course, made statistical analysis more complicated, albeit more realistic. Nonetheless, the chosen placement led to these assumptions: that either there had been an oversight in the design of the research instrument or that the position of registrar might be in a potentially dynamic state that warranted further attention.

**Recent Developments in Museum Training, 1975 — 1979**

Since the time of the NEA study, several prominent efforts have been made to advance the professionalism of museum staff members. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, one of the first to recognize the need for in-service education of a more practical, yet studious nature, has changed its admissions policy to include a larger proportion of professionals in its valuable seminars.[22] The Office of Museum Programs, The Smithsonian Institution, has offered annually a series of basic training workshops to personnel from museums of various types.[23] Programs at Old Sturbridge Village and Cooperstown, New York State museums, have contributed substantive technical information toward developing expertise among employees.[24]

However, courses like these are without continuity and of short duration, serving limited enrollments. As far as we know there is little

sharing of instructional materials among these programs. General texts are few in number, with most being published by professional organizations rather than by major commercial publishers. Translations of available texts are also sorely needed for training staff employed in developing countries.

In most situations, terminal projects by students, done either by individuals or in groups, continue to provide the primary mode for evaluation. There are few, if any, formal approaches to measure achievement or to determine a quality level of transfer from course work to actual job performance.

The most recent attempt to offer an intensive course within an extended, but more variable, time frame was made by Museums Collaborative, a New York-based agency, in the Spring of 1978, drawing upon faculty from the Business School of Columbia University, New York. Another similar offering will be made during the summer months of 1979 by the Western Association of Art Museums (WAAM) in cooperation with professors from the University of California.[25] Nonetheless there is still much that remains to be done on behalf of persons practicing in the museum field.

Concurrent with developments already noted has been an increasing thrust on the part of the American Association of Museums, The American Association of State and Local History and other professional organizations to offer workshops and seminars during their meetings and to augment the supply of useful publications for professional training.[26] Within the AAM, for example, members of a newly created Museum Training Committee have been contributing volunteer effort toward carrying further the work of the former Curriculum Committee.[27] In subsequent months, criteria for enrollment in museum studies programs will have become more clearly determined. There appears to be a widening, as well as less wary, acceptance of productive interaction with representatives from the academic community. It is likely, therefore, that the attention of this group — as well as the museum profession at large — will soon be more directly turned toward the continuing education of current practitioners and that preferences for academic or nontraditional settings will soon provoke lively discussion. At that time, the inherent diversity of museum work will require considerably more detailed study on how staff operations and/or standards should be made to interrelate within an advanced curriculum, however offered.

It was in anticipation of such an eventual shift of emphasis that *Profile of A Museum Registrar,* the research effort focal to this report, was initiated.

# II

# Rationale For Study

*Profile of A Museum Registrar* represents the first full-scale, independent study directed toward the educational needs and interests of a selected group of museum employees to be conducted by an institution of higher learning in collaboration with a nationally recognized museum.[8]

Although the primary objective of this project has been to provide helpful data toward the development of materials and methods for the training and education of museum registrars, there is an encompassing rationale behind the construct of its five research components.

Within a growing number of museums that have amassed collections of recognized value, the art of acquisition and scholarship of provenance are losing their respective priorities of emphasis among trustees charged with the preservation and display of things they hold for the public.

In the face of deterioration of museum objects believed to be caused by more frequent exhibition, closer attention is being paid to the business at hand, or one might say, *in* the hand of each staff member responsible for the care and management of collections.

There is real anxiety being expressed about skills, logistics and costs pertaining to what can best be described as the grand housekeeping functions of a museum, regardless of type: condition reporting, cataloguing, storage, insurance and environmental control.

Related to this concern is the fact that heightened mobility of objects, prompted by a desire to satisfy public interest, has changed packing and shipping from a relatively straightforward set of processes to a complex system demanding continual revision of information and critical evaluation of services rendered.

Very little has been done to study museum functions in terms of how each staff role interrelates with others in the performance of daily tasks. Nor has it been determined to what extent collaborative activity is required among staff to minimize stress upon the objects and, at the same time, reduce the cost of operations.

It was conceded only recently that both role and function within various categories of museum work are indeterminate. In a thorough survey of placement opportunities, Susan Stitt has observed that "almost all of the literature on museum workers is impressionistic."[9] Stitt attributes the imperfect flow of labor reform about museum jobs to a lack of precise information about the duties involved as well as to a general insensitivity to the need for more targeted educational programs for personnel employed in museums.[10] It would follow, one tends to conclude from the literature, that without a working model

within a particular segment of personnel, listing of duties for most job descriptions in museums would be something like a Chinese shadow play: many details presented in the foreground, but with much more going on behind the scenes.

Essentially, then, the concept for this study grew from a realization shared by the investigator and advisers drawn from the museum profession that more attention must be given to a particular group of personnel to find out what they actually *do*, rather than what they should do, what they *are* like rather than what they should be like, so as to discover how each staff member might be encouraged to perform in order to satisfy his own expectations for advancement while, at the same time, attempting to meet standards set by directors, trustees or professional associations. By so doing, it was felt that staff development might be accelerated on a more practical, yet academically sound, basis, with criteria for promotion more clearly tied to achievements shown during the learning process.

This view was further supported by an incisive analysis of James Kittleman.[1] As a consultant actively engaged in assisting museums to find competent persons for available positions, Kittleman suggests that some of the concerns about job performance could be more effectively dealt with if museum trustees and directors were to apply modern management principles to their administrative systems, a more rational, workmanlike approach to standards of procedure, personnel relations and career development. Kittleman recommends that a governing body of a museum should have within itself functional committees coordinated with museum activities. In this way, he contends, a plan of administrative organization would be built around *functions* instead of people, without sacrificing human values or professional aspirations.

Once the concept for this study was formulated, there emerged the central problem of selecting a single category of museum personnel for an intensive survey of educational needs and interests.

The position of museum registrar appeared to be radially joined on a daily basis to procedures carried out by other staff members, especially those of the curator, conservator and assistant director. It was also observed that in a museum where there is no registrar on staff, many registrarial functions are performed by these other members.

Informal dialogue about a study on museum registrars with persons associated with or engaged in museum practice (as well as with others employed elsewhere) brought forth almost immediately the same hesitant question, "Just what . . . does a registrar do?"

It appeared that almost everyone is familiar with how a director or a curator fits into a museum. Many are even more aware and, one might say, more cognizant of how a security guard functions, but a registrar? Educators frequently added, "Does the person have something to do with filing records or listing museum courses?" It seemed that we had, perhaps, arrived at the fringe of a relatively unacknowledged "grey area" in the organizational structure of a museum.

Further investigation revealed that people holding positions as registrars in museums had begun to organize for recognition within

the AAM as a standing professional committee. Their activities stemmed from agreement among themselves that responsibilities, as well as training programs, for registrars had been poorly defined and that on-the-job experience could no longer be the primary source of professional instruction. They were urging informational exchange to identify levels of competency and technical expertise considered essential to the fulfillment of a registrar's duties and to increase their professionalism by establishing commonalities of procedure within coordinated training programs.[12]

The most compulsive factor in selecting this group as an index population for the study was the convergence of interest that took place between museum registrars currently active in what, in other circles, might well be spoken of as "a movement" and educators involved in developing the research design for this study. Thinking in both sectors developed in a most unusual and dynamic way throughout the proposal-writing phase of the project and beyond.

Through informal conferences with publishers, it was further confirmed that there is a need to have a systematic understanding of what kinds of instructional materials exist for the museum field and how various forms of print and nonprint media meet requirements, as well as preferences, of professional students. It was also learned that there is considerable interest in knowing how and where training programs should be conducted so as to determine whether or not new materials on selected topics should be produced and, if so, how they should be distributed.

It was thought that creating reference films and/or videotapes showing technical procedures for the handling, storage, shipping and packing of museum objects would appreciably improve the effectiveness of the printed materials already in use. By providing component illustrations in motion and in color with appropriate sound narration, such films and videotapes would not only clarify basic concepts but also motivate the detailed tasks described in these publications. It was pointed out by registrars serving as advisers that this could be one of the best ways to conserve objects and specimens in a collection: to increase the competency of personnel in respect to how they handle things on an everyday basis.

**Objectives**

The dialogue that grew between registrars and the university staff brought forth a research and development project that would attempt to:

1. delineate the role and functions of a museum registrar in general and specific terms;
2. establish guidelines for training materials and methods;
3. produce a pilot videotape as a media research component on selected topic of study.

In a series of frank discussions, oftentimes by long-distance telephone, it was gradually learned that a registrar is a museum employee

who for some time has been regarded by other staff members as only semi-professional, whose role derived from either secretary or librarian and who is, therefore, below the status of curator or conservator by considerable degree in most institutions. This accounted in part, some registrars said, for the zealous effort to form a representative body within their professional association.

Prompted by this information, the project design was extended to include another potentially unifying objective:

4. to find out from directors, as well as from registrars, how this position is perceived within the organizational structure of a museum and what traits and expertise are considered desirable for an applicant when a museum registrar is to be hired.

This additional component of study has what might be called its own sub-rationale. It is based on a theory developed by Anne Galen Brooke, a student of Arnheim, who believes that[11]

> confrontation may single out, highlight, and purify a single quality . . . Pairing affects the partners. And seeing the partners from a third perspective can alter these two, as well.

In a controlled experiment, Brooke showed that a strongly stylized painting by Karel Appel can make a Modigliani figure look realistic, whereas the same Modigliani can look suddenly flat when confronted with a Cezanne portrait. In other words, an arbitrary confrontation changes the perception of the two components of a pair, but not for long. This confrontation presses for relation on more formal terms, and under this pressure the common elements come to the fore in a new state of purity. *It is then that a change can be produced that is more in keeping with the overall structure of the entire content.*

It is likely that as the reader confronts this concept, it will appear, at first, to be a digression from the rationale, and the question arises: How does it relate to the project?

Consider this: if museum registrars look at themselves, their work and each other, they may see again as well as anew. If museum directors look at registrars as members of a group at large and not only as their own employees, they may see registrars differently. They may also see themselves differently. If educators look at both registrars and directors and try to envision themselves as an integral part of the teaching-learning process that may help to bring both professional groups toward growth and satisfaction, they may also find new roles and avenues for themselves. There is rarely a search that finds the treasure exactly where it is mapped.

But the process, as well as the completed project, is now before us to discuss and analyze.

Let us proceed to an overview of what has been accomplished, going from there to determine whether or not there is in the various components some useful information that will not only serve registrars but also support a workable model for further research into other areas of museum practice.

# III

# Overview of the Project

*Profile of a Museum Registrar* represents the first independent research effort directed toward the mid-career training of a particular group of museum professionals.

A primary objective of the project was to assess the educational needs and interests of professionals in preparation for developing new approaches to advanced study on collections management.

To more clearly identify staff responsibilities and determine commonality of procedures among different types of museums, attention was directed toward a selected area of personnel: museum registrars. This focal effort would involve a comprehensive analysis of functions performed by those working in this capacity along with a detailed investigation of their educational backgrounds and work experiences. In this way, the scope and content required for an advanced course dealing with standards of practice for a museum registrar could be more clearly determined and, at the same time, a research model could be developed for replication on behalf of other museum personnel.

## Research Design: Five Components

Following a pilot study made during an experiential seminar arranged by the American Association of Museums before the 1979 annual meeting at Seattle, a survey booklet was designed to encourage museum registrars to express how they view themselves in relation to their work. Items of inquiry were constructed to explore functions they perform so as to determine how often or to what extent this work is done. Registrars were asked to select topics for study and to indicate how they prefer to be instructed. (see Appendix A: Facsimile of Survey Booklet.)

Survey booklets were mailed to 434 museum registrars in the United States and Canada, using a mailing list compiled with the cooperation of the Registrars Committee of the AAM and the executive staff of the Canadian Museums Association.

The second component took the form of a complementary survey among 100 museum directors within the United States to determine how the role of registrar is perceived by them and to elicit suggestions about setting, course content and faculty for a personnel training program on museum practices.

This survey was conducted through telephone interviews recorded on audiotape by permission of the directors participating. Full

transcriptions were made to provide data correlative to that provided by the survey booklets.

Videotapes in color were produced on study topics selected by registrars. One is a companion pilot to the main topic, "Packing and Shipping," which was chosen in the survey at Seattle. The other is part of a formal comparison of photographic techniques for "Condition Reporting," the topic selected in the actual survey. These productions represent the third and fourth components of the research design.

The fifth component is an annotated bibliography compiled by members of the advisement group to the project. Selection of reference materials was based on providing reading matter for immediate use by museum registrars during their professional activities or advanced studies.

Data gathered from the project is analyzed and interpreted in the following section of this report. Information about procedures, when relevant, is presented along with the outcomes.

# IV

# Outcomes: Analysis and Interpretation

## How Museum Registrars View Themselves in Relation to Their Work

In order to find out what museum registrars want to learn more about and how they would like selected topics of study to be taught, this component was designed to encourage self-evaluation within a professional context. To the fullest possible extent, responses were elicited from an individual viewpoint.

Demographic information and other quantitative data were also sought to determine a commonality of interest in subject matter and to assist in the development of useful materials for the training and education of museum registrars.

### Procedures of Survey

The pilot-tested version of the survey booklet consisted of 45 sections of varying length which asked for single or multiple responses. Open-ended commentary was invited on aspects of professional background and museum functions as these pertained to registrarial functions. (see Appendix A: Facsimile of Survey Booklet.)

Since it was not known how many museum professionals other than those shown on the mailing list are employed as registrars or perform registrarial functions at their museums, the population used for this survey cannot, in the strictest sense, be regarded as intact but rather as one provided by the profession and considered to be duly representative.

### Level and Nature of Response

Booklets were returned by 256 museum registrars, providing a sample of the population at a substantive level of 59 percent. This level was amplified by 42 personal letters and descriptive attachments voluntarily submitted in lieu of or in addition to making a direct response to the booklet.

The quality of response bears special mention. Registrars evidently gave much time and thought to the questions asked. Sections requiring more than numerals or check marks were filled in with detailed notations and important facts. In some cases, separate memoranda were inserted, offering further discussion or assistance.

**Procedures for Analysis of Data**

In order to interpret the results of this survey, the following steps were taken:

1. Each booklet was reviewed item by item. Those items relating to qualitative information were excluded from computational procedures. Remaining items were coded for processing by computer.
2. Data were keypunched and processed by a packaged computer program (SPSS). Types of analyses performed were determination and/or adjustment of frequencies for each variable, cross tabulations for selected variables in order to explore relationships between variables.
3. Qualitative information was read by the Investigator in collaboration with the Registrar Associate, using hand tabulation to establish order of emphasis and frequency of mention.

After the data were processed, the following commentary was prepared, drawing upon the presentation of tables, as appropriate.

**Results from Survey of Registrars**

*Citizenship.* As might be expected, most of the registrars represented by this survey are United States citizens. A small proportion (8.2%) are Canadians employed in museums within various provinces of their native country.

*Sex.* Historically, the role of museum registrar has been cast as a female one. It was molded early on by the composition of training classes offered by the Newark Museum and further encouraged by customary decision of museum directors to extend the duties of secretaries and librarians to meet the management needs of growing collections.

Therefore, it is of particular interest that 22 percent of the respondents are male. There are, however, no available data on how this proportion of males to females among museum registrars compares to that of previous years. It has been observed that the number of men working in this position has been increasing gradually during the past decade.[14]

The hiring of a man as registrar tends to occur in a large museum where a staff member with this title assumes the duties of an administrative assistant. In an institution of considerable size, the work that is done by the registrar is more directly related to a director's responsibilities than to those of a curator.

There can be no prediction made as to whether or not male registrars will soon be performing more typical functions in smaller museums or if the number will continue to increase. This factor, if monitored by the profession, may eventually reflect or modify the job description of a registrar as well as influence the salary paid.

***Age.*** There appears to be no significant difference between the ages of males and the ages of females employed as registrars in museums. Regardless of sex, most registrars are relatively young persons between 21 and 39 years of age beginning their careers in the museum profession through this mode of work. The inclusive ages, however, are from 21 to 60 years and over. (see Appendix A, Table 1: Cross Tabulation of Age by Sex.)

***Types of Museums Represented by Responses.*** Replies came mainly from art museums (42%) or a combination of types (23%). It was anticipated that Natural History or Science museums would be minimally shown in the response, since it is generally recognized that performance of registrarial duties is usually carried out in these institutions by staff members working directly with curators in charge of a particular division of the collections.

Most of the museums represented (87%) are either public institutions or have a combination of public and private governance.

The response received is broadly representative of geographical regions established by the AAM, with proportions of response evenly distributed among them.

Most of the museums where respondents are employed are well established, having been in operation on an average of 42 years, with 16 percent having been in existence for 88 years or more.

***Size of collections*** handled by these registrars varies considerably, with 16 percent of the museums represented having objects or specimens numbering between 10,000 and 20,000 and 36 percent holding more than 30,000 pieces.

***Museum Characteristics Importantly Related to Registrar Functions.*** A dominant characteristic which, according to some registrars, "makes us indispensable," is that the collections, regardless of size, have in many museums gone uncatalogued until recently. Registrars report that they spend a large portion of their time striving to remedy this. In some museums, this effort is supported by a large number of volunteers supervised by the registrar.

Other characteristics are shown in order of emphasis, with selected comments:

1. broad physical dispersion of museum facilities, requiring meticulous record of placement and movement of collections

   *The 12 museum houses and 20 other properties managed by this organization are located in a working, living town located on a one-mile street. Registrarial functions (inventory control, accessioning systems and photographic records) are vital to the daily operation of the museum.*

2. accelerated activity in respect to exhibitions, loans, gifts

   *Circulating exhibitions within the country have doubled for us during the past five years. Major exhibitions from all over the world are handled by us continuously. We also have a very active Extension Department which circulates parts of the collection all through the year.*

   *Increase in what we call "blockbuster" international shows has presented a greater demand for accurate, fast recordkeeping.*

3. small staff with overlapping duties

   *This is a problem that often goes unrecognized. If the staff is too small, wearing too many hats, records become haphazard and care of objects too relaxed.*

4. age of museum, length of time collections have been held

   *Our collection is heavily drawn upon by scholars; there is also extensive research activity by curatorial staff.*

5. growing demand for statewide or national programs providing educational services

   *Our department has been put in charge of lending and receiving educational kits containing artifacts, books and films.*

6. no conservator on staff, so all conservation problems are under registrar's supervision

7. storage in separate building requires a registrar in charge

8. all records are generated from office registrar, as curatorial staff is minimal

9. large curatorial and technical staff require daily linkage through registrar

***Exhibition Activity.*** In all patterns of museum exhibition listed, there is a high degree of activity reported, creating a regular and heavy demand on the registrars' services.

***Operating Budgets.*** For 52 percent of those who applied, registrars' operating budgets are $7,000 or more, with 14 percent reporting that no specific budget is allocated to their departments.

***Employment and Salary.*** Almost all (92%) are employed on a full-time salaried basis. Well over half earn between $8,000 and $12,999 annually, with 18 percent of earnings distributed above and below this level in equal porportion. Only seven percent earn $18,000 or more. Most of those in the highest paid category have been registrars for a long time or, as in several cases, have additional duties within educational or curatorial departments. The median income is comparable to that of a librarian, a registered nurse or an administrative assistant in a small corporation. It is less than that of a registrar in a university, whose average salary is $20,000."

***Registrars' Proficiency in Languages.*** Fewer than one percent have reported a speaking proficiency in languages other than English. More, however, can read in French (32%), Spanish (13%) and German (13%). These figures reflect an appropriate adjustment of frequencies for French Canadian responses.)

***Academic Degrees Held by Registrars.*** Nine registrars (4%) hold the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, having majored in Art History or Studio Art. Slightly more than a third have earned degrees at the master's level, and almost half (47%) have completed postsecondary study at the undergraduate level.

***Major Programs of Study Undertaken.*** Regardless of academic level achieved, Art History is the program of major study undertaken by well over a fourth (30%) of these museum professionals. Following are Studio Art (17%), Liberal Arts (15%) and History (14%). Other areas of study reported are Interior Design, English, Zoology, Education and Geology.

***Student Experience with Nonprint Media.*** In addition to seeking more information about academic programs of study, this survey wanted to know more about how registrars were taught, with particular emphasis on the use of instructional materials other than textbooks.

Slightly less than half have been taught by viewing films, and only 30 percent have viewed videotapes for educational purposes. Audiocassettes are the least familiar to 82 percent of the registrars in this group.

However, almost two thirds are accustomed to the use of slides in the classroom and 41 percent with the use of slide/tape materials. (see Appendix A, Table 2: Forms of Media in Previous Educational Experience.)

***Certificate or Non-degree Programs.*** Slightly more than a third have earned certificates or participated in some form of non-degree study. Selections were eclectic and appear, for the most part, to have been made on an independent basis. Most study has been undertaken since 1968, and of these, participation has been more frequent since 1973, with an increasing tendency shown toward studying through professional organizations.

***Relation of Educational Background to Collections.*** Almost three fourths of the group feel that their former studies correlate closely, or reasonably so, to the objects they handle in their daily work.

Why, then, one is motivated to ask, are registrars so eager to extend their professional training? What is it they want that they do not have in order to meet either their own career expecations or the demands of their employers?

***Critical Lacks in Training.*** Respondents addressed this section of the survey booklet thoughtfully and openly.

Emphasized by most is *the lack of adequate information on conservation terms as these are applied to condition reporting,* followed by *insufficient preparation on legal procedures and statutory regulations pertaining to collection management.*

In general, those who are prepared in Art History, Studio Art or other academic disciplines say that they feel a critical lack of training in business aspects of museum work. Conversely, those who came to their jobs with training or previous work experience in secretarial skills, accounting or other practical areas say they would like to learn more about the collections held by their museums.

For specific illustration, following are some mentions by registrars of critical lacks:

> *No formal or specific course on registrarial methods was available*

*Need to know more about storage guidelines, techniques*

*Very little exposure to theory or application of computers*

Comments reveal a strong concern for higher standards of practice for themselves and their associates. Still others convey frustration about or insufficient knowledge of what can be done to fill those lacks.

*There is little or no professional supervision of my work to enable me to learn what I need to know in order to improve what I do.*

*I acquired these responsibilities by chance, not by training, and I need to know more about standard procedures of museum registration.*

*There needs to be a more specific understanding on the part of directors and curators about what the role of a registrar is before a good course can be offered.*

*Most of what I have learned and applied to my job has been from textbooks; there is little or no demonstration in the field.*

*The registrar's job was a very unstructured position when I first came here. It's one thing to learn what to do on the job; it's another thing to learn what's important.*

*There are, as far as I know, no training sessions for professionals held in a museum — which is where they really belong.*

As might *not* be expected, more than a few registrars say that a critical lack is that they do not know how to type.

***Special Training in Museum Practice.*** Fewer than 20 percent of respondents have had courses in Museology, or as is more often heard now, Museum Practice.

More of the registrars (35%) indicate that they received training in museum work as volunteers rather than in academic settings or certification programs. Over three fourths (77%) acknowledge that on-the-job experience has been and continues to be the main source of training for the work they do (see Appendix A, Table 3: How Registrars Received Formal Training in Museum Work.)

Internships have not figured largely in anyone's experience. This item in the survey booklet failed to identify whether internships reported took place within an academic program or later in conjunction with employment.

***Training Most Valued.*** A large majority of the registrars state that on-the-job experience is the most valued part of their training to date.

Valued next are internships and practicums. Among those mentioned are programs offered by the Museum of Modern Art, the University of Michigan and the University of Delaware.

Third in importance are workshops held at museum conferences sponsored by professional organizations.

***Previous Employment Experiences.*** Knowing about previous employment experience is an important factor in the development of a useful curriculum for students at mid-career. Surprisingly, almost a fourth (22%) of the respondents spent, on an average, 3.8 years as teachers before they came to work in a museum, yet they are not working as museum educators.

Over a third worked as secretaries somewhat longer before becoming museum registrars. Although it is traditionally assumed that the skills of a librarian transfer readily to the functions of a museum registrar, only 15 percent have been drawn from this field of employment to museum work. Some (11%) have been curators, and a few have had previous experience as conservators.

It was not anticipated that experience with computer systems operations would be reported often. However, four percent were employed as keypunchers.

***Time Spent at Present Employment.*** A majority (88%) have been working where they are for ten years, although the inclusive range of time is from one to 31 years. This extent of continuity in work choice shows more stability than might be expected in view of changeable patterns of employment usually found at other staff levels, particularly those of director and curator.

***Professional Title Held.*** Over half hold the title of Registrar. About 22 percent hold a title other than that of Registrar at their museums, but they perform registrarial functions under alternate titles. Almost the same number are designated as Registrar but have additional titles and duties.

***Preference for Title.*** Half prefer the title of Registrar to any of the other titles suggested. The next title, preferred by 17 percent, is Curator for Registration, followed in similar proportion by Assistant Director of Records and Collection. Other titles submitted are Curator for Records and Collections, Curator of Collections and Publications, Administrator of Records and Collections, Reality Coordinator.

There are enough differences of opinion about title to indicate that the matter should be given careful thought by museum directors when they next consider problems of organizational structure. Or perhaps the matter of title should be openly discussed among museum registrars to gain a consensus. This may also be an important issue related to dissatisfaction in other areas relevant to registrarial work.

***Staff Assistance.*** Most (94%) are assisted by volunteers rather than by a paid staff. Among those who have paid staff members, there is a relatively balanced proportion of full-time and half-time people, with few in number in either category.

(Registrars appreciatively cite the work of volunteers who assist them, but they emphasize that there is a strong need for continuity of involvement on the part of volunteers so as to maintain standards of practice and minimize the necessity for in-service training programs.)

***Analysis of Functions.*** Functions selected by the Registrar Associate and advisers were listed under three areas: Permanent Collection(s), Temporary Collection(s) and General Business. Functions within these represent a consensus as to what *most* registrars do during the course of their daily work, but there was no knowledge among advisers about which functions are, in actuality, common to this staff role.

Respondents were asked to decide which of these functions were carried out by them always, often, occasionally, sometimes or never.

The computer programming arranged for analyzing this section of the survey booklet took into account the various frequencies of response in categories, and in a series of cross tabulations combined with one-way analysis of variance, functions were turned into numerical patterns and percentages of proportions were collapsed into visible collectives of action.

The result is that a *composite* profile can now be drawn of functions commonly performed by a museum registrar, regardless of type of museum, subject to the kind of collection activity engaged in by these institutions.

*Figure 1.*
**Profile by Computer of**
**Registrarial Functions Performed in Museums of All Types.**

*Permanent Collections*

- cataloging collection material
- controlling storage inventory
- accessioning and applying to number systems
- processing outgoing loans
- making arrangements for shipping
- filing
- typing

*Temporary Exhibitions*

- preparing loan agreements
- assigning to number systems
- supervising packing and unpacking
- maintaining and updating records
- making arrangements for shipping
- arranging for insurance coverage
- condition reporting
- filing
- typing

The level of commonality for most functions shown in the profile above appears to be higher among art museums than among museums in general, particularly processing of outgoing loans from the collections and accessioning to number systems. Registrars in art museums also tend to be more active in making arrangements for shipping and insurance coverage. These data correlate realistically with recent increase in traveling exhibitions and donations among art museums throughout the world.

There is no function that is performed by *all* museum registrars *all* of the time.

In addition to establishing commonality of functions, computerization of frequencies of a performance falling within selected categories further describes the *intrinsic diversity* of a museum registrar's job.

There are functions that are obviously formative, subject to either the press of time or situational constraints. Writing reports to the director or reporting activities for staff information take place in a broadly ranging but narrowly applied pattern of frequency. About a fourth of the registrars either constantly or often conduct research on the collection. These activities lack sufficient commonality among museums to infer that any is done as a matter of policy or integral part of the job description.

A function carried out by registrars in other museums to a greater degree than among those working only in art museums is that of *serving as liaison to visiting scholars.* It can be readily assumed that this is because scholars who come to art museums to study collections are more often referred to the curator for assistance.

This would suggest that registrars employed in smaller museums holding other kinds of collections (*i.e.,* anthropological, historical) might be expected to have even more formal backgrounds relating to the objects or specimens they handle than is expected of registrars in art museums.

In history museums, registrars are busier processing insurance claims than arranging for insurance coverage. *Condition reporting is, apparently, conducted more sporadically within these museums, with over 13 percent of the history museums (represented in this study) never doing it.*

Administratively, it appears that a registrar in an historically oriented museum is more often involved in preparing or redesigning transaction forms. *Maintaining and upgrading of permanent records,* according to these data, *is also a function more often performed at historical museums than at others. In terms of frequency, there is also more uneven control of inventory storage among history museums.* Whether this is because of a spasmodic flow of objects unlike that of an organized exhibition schedule or because of an inadequate staff is not known. *A minimal amount of time is being directed toward training staff members in care and handling.* Fewer than a third of the respondents do this only on an occasional basis, and 24 percent of those working in history museums say that they never do.

Although a number of registrars mentioned that the prospect of couriering in conjunction with traveling exhibitions has attracted them to employment at large museums and, once there, provided balm to the more menial pains of the job, data on this function show that *only a few are given the opportunity to go along with the shows while they travel.* Whether this relates to lack of proficiency in languages, as shown in an earlier part of this report, is not known. It is more likely that most museums need their registrars to stay on the job for essential business.

(For specific information on frequency patterns of function, data are arranged by four categories of museum, All, Art, History and Combination, and are separately displayed in a series of tables found in Appendix A, Functions Performed by Museum Registrars, Tables 10 through 12.)

***In-Service/On-the-Job Training.*** There are occasional on-the-job training sessions held for a few registrars at their own museums. For four percent of this group, such meetings are scheduled once a year, for five percent, twice a year and for three percent, monthly. Two percent benefit from weekly sessions for professional development, but *for almost everyone, it appears that training is a trial and error process during the course of each day's activities.*

***Satisfaction with On-the-Job Training.*** A substantial number (62%) are not satisfied with on-the-job training they receive.

***Affiliation with an Academic Institution.*** Yet, it appears that few registrars have opportunities to receive training otherwise than on the job. Only 18 percent of the museums where they are employed are linked, formally or not, with a college or university that offers a program for professional development, although 29 percent are associated with colleges and universities for the purpose of providing scholarly research, presenting exhibitions or lending parts of a collection.

There are a small number of off-campus programs offered (18%), with only six seminars noted. Consultation given off campus is rare.

Degree programs and seminars on campus are even less in evidence (8%). As might be expected, consultation is more often available on campus.

In general, there seems to be only a minimal effort being made by the academic community to address the needs of museum staff for further practical training or formal education. Herewith, indicative comment submitted:

> *Unless I would wish to work on a doctorate, there is little offered at my present professional level.*
>
> *Boring, some of them (academic programs offered). Too restricted to local and regional issues rather than to broad national concerns.*
>
> *I tried to institute such a program with a local college, but too much paper work and too little interest.*

*There are no advanced courses that relate specifically to registration.*

*Our museum will entertain requests for attending classes, conferences, seminars, either partially or fully funded.*

The next section of the survey dealt with theoretical aspects rather than with actual situations. This section was an attempt to determine what museum registrars would like to learn during their continuing education.

***Topics Selected for Study.*** Of 13 topics presented, the one consistently rated as most important is "Condition Reporting," followed in order of preference by "Storage Design and Methods", "Insurance", and "Shipping/Packing". The topic consistently rated as least important is "Film and Videotape Production," with "Importing/Exporting" and "Cataloging by Computer" also rather low in order of preference (see Appendix A, Table 5, Selected Topics for Study in Order of Preference by Mode, and Table 6, Selected Topics for Study in Order of Preference by Percentage).

***Preferences for Modes of Instruction.*** Findings noted earlier in this analysis revealed that most registrars have had only limited experience with film and video materials in previous teaching/learning situations. With the exception of preferring to *listen* to an instructor speak on a topic, other-than-print methods are less than enthusiastically accepted. Registrars would prefer to study mainly by means of lectures and textbooks, with demonstrations and pamphlets being received more favorably than various forms of electronic media.

Overall, preferences for a particular mode change little from topic to topic. However, in the case of "Condition Reporting" and "Storage: Design and Methods," there is a relatively higher level of preference shown for the use of slides and films. Producers and users of instructional materials may find it helpful to study a chart prepared to display specific responses (see Appendix A, Table 7, Preference for Forms of Media By Study Topic and Frequency of Mention).

***Preferences for Types of Training Programs.*** Although it has been reported that some respondents never have a training session at their own museums, many (83%) would rather learn more about their work in a seminar presented at a museum or in an on-the-job situation than attend a seminar during a conference held by a professional association. Almost half (46%) would rather engage in independent study than sign up for an academic program. The problem, then, arises: *If registrars are not satisfied with on-the-job training, if many profess a strong desire to study on their own, yet most want to advance their professionalism in a museum setting, what kind of training program can be created that would meet these needs and preferences?* This inquiry produces another question, in turn: *How many museum professionals other than or in addition to registrars would say that they feel the same way, if asked?* Possible solutions are reserved for discussion in a later section of this report (see Appendix A, Table 8, Preference for Types of Training Programs by Percentages).

***Preference for Composition of Faculty in Training Programs.*** Almost three fourths of those responding would prefer to be taught by a faculty that would include museum registrars and other museum professionals but which would also bring to the teaching/learning experience a combination of academic faculty and representatives from business organizations. Fewer than one percent felt that they would like to be taught only by an academic faculty.

***Direction of Coursework for Training.*** Almost three fourths of this group would like to have coursework that presents technical aspects of their work *in combination with* the history and philosophy of museums, management theory and practice, as well as academic content from disciplines appropriate to collections they encounter in their regular duties (see Appendix A, Table 9, Preference for Coursework in Training Programs by Percentage).

A desirable way to be regarded on a job, whatever the field, is to be understood and appreciated beyond a moderate degree by one's employer or governing body. According to this survey, recognition of this sort for museum registrars is not much of a problem.

***Understanding and Appreciation Received at Place of Employment.*** Over half of the respondents expressed the opinion that they were either *absoultely* or considerably understood and appreciated by these persons. Only three percent said, "Not at all."

However, there is widely scattered evaluation concerning the possibility of receiving financial support from employers and/or trustees for advanced training.

***Encouragement of Advanced Training by Museums.*** The average view held is that there would be only moderate encouragement toward this sort of endeavor. This conservative stance may relate primarily to availability of funds or a reluctance on the part of the director to approve released time. There would have to be more dialogue with registrars and directors on this aspect to discover the reasons.

***Willingness of Museum to Provide Financial Support for Advanced Training.*** Almost a third (33%) do not know if their museums would help to pay for their professional studies. In fact, the degree of surety in response to this item is almost equally divided between "Yes," "No" and "Don't know." Again, more dialogue, openly and behind the scenes, is needed before these data are useful in more than an indicative sense.

Nonetheless, 86 percent of the respondents are interested in pursuing further study.

If an important key to approving the time needed to do this and, perhaps, providing some, if not all, of the financial means lies with the museum director, it is important that we turn toward learning how persons serving as chief administrators in museums perceive the role of registrar and, in general, what their thoughts are about training at the mid-career level. We will consider next the results of a series of telephone interviews that sought their views.

## From Museum Directors: A Composite View of the Registrar

Data gathered from a series of telephone interviews with museum directors throughout the United States provide a useful, correlative perspective on the role and functions of a museum registrar. In addition, these administrators have selected topics for study at a mid-career level and made suggestions for museum training programs that could be directed toward the continuing education of other staff members, as well.

### Procedures for Selection of Sample

One hundred directors were selected through the use of a random table applied to drawing from listings given in The Official Museum Directory.[16]

In establishing the method of randomization to be employed, a member of the Directory's staff was consulted to determine the proportion of types of museums currently represented in this publication. An attempt was made to replicate the same conditions during the random process of selection, using the table in successive rounds according to existing proportions.

Arrangements were made by the Registrar Associate to use nationwide telephone lines at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum for the interviews. A series of dates was approved by the museum staff prior to sending letters to directors requesting appointments for conversation.

### Level and Nature of Response

Replies were received from 92 directors on the selection list of one hundred. Sixty eight (73%) of those who replied said they would be available for interview by telephone.

Time and date of each call were confirmed with the directors involved. Despite numerous efforts to arrive at a mutually convenient time, it was not possible to confirm interview dates with 12 persons. It appeared that not enough time had been set aside for the use of telephone lines to accommodate these variables. Letters of regret and apology were exchanged.

The group scheduled for interviewing numbered 56, slightly more than half of the random sample obtained at the outset of the selection process. Despite the fact that the number of willing interviewees was reduced by logistical constraints, this percentage compares favorably with the percentage of reply shown for the survey of registrars (58%).

It should be noted that the sample of interviewees was obtained from an intact source without prior notice, whereas registrars had been alerted to the survey process through a newsletter of the AAM, as well as by the pilot seminar. Therefore, the level of response obtained from museum directors is to be regarded as being relatively higher than the response obtained from registrars. Also, by means of the random process employed, the finalized sample is more representative than the actual number may suggest.

**Conduct of Interviews**

Interviews were conducted by the Principal Investigator over a two month period. Fifteen minutes were allotted for each conversation."

A transcript digest of interview content was mailed to the appropriate director for approval. It was requested that permission be given to reproduce all or portions of the content for this report. Permission was granted by 97 percent of those interviewed.

**Summary of Interview Response**

Results obtained from these interviews reflect a high level of awareness concerning the importance of increasing avenues and opportunities for mid-career training within the museum profession.

Qualities for an *ideal* registrar are highlighted in many of the remarks made by directors, yet requirements are drawn from pragmatic observation, careful thought and real experiences. In some cases, those who were interviewed were actually in the process of seeking a registrar for their museums and found the process useful for verbalizing their needs.

To illustrate the natural speaking style and personal philosophy of respondents, segments from transcript digests revealing emphases germane to the inquiry are herewith reproduced.

**What qualities/characteristics (educational background, professional skills, temperament) would you seek in a registrar for your museum?**

The person would need some background in museum techniques and functions. We are basically a history museum, so this person would also need a broad background in American History, both western European and native American. I think we're talking about a master's level. She or he would need to have a good knowledge of what is going on in the worlds of computer storage, programming, microfilm techniques, storage. I'd be looking for somebody who loves to count things, somebody who sees that it is so important to keep track of things. Registrars are very special people. I think they are born, not made. You need somebody who has a great sense of history, who believes that the preservation of information is very, very important.

*William R. Best, Thomas Gilcrease Institute of American History and Art, Tulsa, Oklahoma*

In our situation, we are talking about someone who would have experience in material culture, so that they can handle ethnographic or historical materials from a native Southwest, and who would be familiar with the archaeology of the Southwest. Our collection is very large and we are a research institute. Therefore, this kind of a person is more like an archivist and a reference librarian than a filing clerk. I

think a very sophisticated bachelor's level would be good, but a master's would be better. It would be somebody who really knew cataloging, computer cataloging, somebody who at least had an acquaintance with conservation and the techniques involved with that. I would look for the same kind of temperament you would look for in anyone working on a professional level. They have to be able to get along very well with their co-workers as well as with the people who work for them and with the research and scientific staff. Somebody who is a self-starter, does not need a lot of direction.

*Hermann K. Bleibtreu, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff, Arizona*

I would look for someone who had at least a master's degree in Art History, because I think they have to know, appreciate and love objects, and that's one demonstration of it. I think it would need to be a person very much concerned with details, a person who could think through a whole sequence of events and think of all of the possibilities that might or might not happen in that sequence of events. The job requires a person who gets along well with all of the people in the museum, because the registrar's office touches every single one. They have to be able to get on the phone and not only sound like they know what they're doing but also convince and cajole people to do various things that are necessary when loans are here. They have to have a great nerve because there are always unforeseen problems coming up, and they have to be able to act quickly. They have to have a great deal of knowledge of the care of an object because they could get a call that one of the trucks is broken down on the highway and all of the atmosphere in that truck has been wiped out. What should they do? They have to be kind of first-aid people in that particular instance. Our registrar is second only to the director, as is the head curator. I think that is the caliber of person that you need.

*Peter Mooz, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond, Virginia*

There are two kinds of educational background that I would be looking at. One would be the kind that comes from schooling directly to the job and then, the other, a good background from in-service training. I'd look for somebody that had, as an entrance qualification for the job, an Art History background. I'd prefer to see some experience or academic familiarity with conservation, and I mean that in the broad sense of the word. Conservation in terms of the care and handling of works, the proper environment and so on, with also some familiarity with laboratory techniques, not skilled in laboratory but knowing how to look at painting surfaces and what kinds of treatment the conservation department uses. I'd like the person to have, in addition to that, management skills, especially advanced clerical skills that would indicate a familiarity with data processing systems. Some other things I would like the person to have (but I don't expect — it would be more apt to be learned on the job and in outside training

while here) are some familiarity with legal problems as they are connected with the movement of art, some experience with security systems. The person must be a diplomat, because he or she must interface with the curatorial department, with the various curators and their assorted personalities. They have to work with donors, lenders, other museums and so on. I see the registrar as a very central role.

*Richard S. Carroll, John and Mable Ringling Art Museum, Sarasota, Florida*

I would look for somebody extremely steady. I think that probably the registrar's position, more than anybody else's, has to be, because of the fact that the registrar is dealing with a potential danger point — work coming in damaged or in bad condition and that kind of problem. It has to be somebody who does not panic, who very methodically goes about the job of recording, notifying the authorities when necessary, dealing calmly with the insurance companies.

I really think that the registrar, with the exception of the director, is the most critical position in the museum.

*Dr. David W. Steadman, Galleries of the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California*

One always hopes to get somebody who has been trained somewhere so that it isn't necessary to train them after they arrive. I would like to see somebody who had already done the job in a smaller institution, preferably an art museum, so that there would be a realistic point of view about how these procedures are carried out in this kind of working situation. I would accept training at the baccalaureate level, depending upon the rest of it.

Librarian background would also be desirable, because one would be looking for a precise, thorough, logical record-keeper type. It would be important, also, for the person to be able to get along well with other people, because of the external problem in museums that that the registrar's work often overlaps with that of the conservator and/or the curator. The work itself is probably more aligned with the work of a librarian than anything I can think of, but the personality should probably be more outgoing than that. This person would have a view of the total operation that's valuable to the director. He or she is apt to become the "soul" of the place — the pivot around which the daily operation moves.

*Richard Grove, Henry Art Gallery, The University of Washington, Seattle, Washington*

**Which of the following topics is *most important* for mid-career professional study: "Computer Processing of Information," "Condition Reporting," "Insurance," "Packing and Shipping" or "Storage"?**

I find it difficult to put priorities on those topics. They're all so very important. For us, of course, there has been a priority of interest and activity in computer processing of information because of a three year grant we had from the National Endowment for the Arts to develop expertise in this area. The project was carried out in collaboration with two other state museums, the National Museum at the University and the Museum of New Mexico. Consequently, our Curator of Collections has been specially trained for this sort of work, and, as a topic of study, we have that one well under control. In respect to the other four, I'd prefer to give them equal value.

*Suzanne de Borhegyi, Museum of Albuquerque, Albuquerque, New Mexico*

I think "Storage" would be at the very top of my list because we have a problem here with antiquated, inadequate storage, and we're trying to bring our storage up to the proper professional level.

Another area that is becoming increasingly important is the insurance thing, because we're just having a dreadful time with our insurance company, and I think that's something that all registrars have got to be more current about.

*Samuel C. Miller, The Newark Museum, Newark, New Jersey*

That's a very difficult question to answer, because you're going into a realm of personal taste (choice of postgraduate studies as to type and pattern of work), particularly in respect to subject matter. However, in terms of the actual time spent by a person who is in a full-time position, I think that one session of a learning experience, however detailed, would be sufficient within one working week, regardless of content. But, there would have to be a broad curriculum offered to satisfy the practicing museum professional.

*Rene-Yvon Lefebyre d'Argence, Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, San Francisco, California*

**What kind(s) of teaching/learning setting and faculty would be appropriate for mid-career level training for registrars and other museum professionals?**

Probably the best experience for them would be in one- to two-week rather intensive workshops which would bring in the variety of registrarial functions that you might find at different types of museums. I think an opportunity to work in one of the major museums that is handling such a tremendous variety of objects would be beneficial to those people that are working in the smaller or specialized museums.

*Dr. Craig S. Black, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

There is a need for a general introduction at a very professional level to all those skills one might find essential to a large institution. Many graduating professionals have never formally studied these matters, are instead more knowledgeable about the collections themselves. I think that some of the fundamentals of storage, preservation, restoration would be important — also some of the more administrative technical aspects relating to insurance, shipping and the other areas you mentioned when you listed the study topics. I think only spotty knowledge exists among those who are performing these functions.

I think it's unlikely that small and medium-sized museums would be able to conveniently release their people for extended periods of time, for something on the order of two weeks of workshop training, as an example. It might be more desirable to have over the course of 12 months four three-day workshops or maybe two one-week workshops, along with specially prepared study materials which I think, could be generated by a museum association or by a university consortium.

The setting isn't quite so important as a rather intensive survey of the needs of the people in the field — one that takes into account the available assets in each field. It would be well to call upon recognized museum people to assist so that there might be, on the long term, improvements in procedures of condition reporting. Undoubtedly, important recommendations would emerge from such sessions.

*William G. Brown, Fairbanks Museum and Planetarium, St. Johnsbury, Vermont*

You might have an annual symposium where the subject is a very specific one like "Storage." For this kind of thing, the only people who know enough to tell other people what to do are registrars who have background and experience plus perhaps specific people who interact with the registrar. In terms of setting, an ideal location would be a large university museum that has some kind of changing exhibitions.

My own view about museology as it is now taught in institutions of higher education is a very dubious one. The role of the educator would be to assist in making a meaningful course or curriculum for these kinds of meetings. I really believe that the people who do the actual teaching should be the specialists in the field who can speak from their own vast experience.

*Richard V. West, E.B. Crocker Art Gallery, Sacramento, California*

It might be nice periodically to let professionals such as the registrars travel around the country and see what is new in record keeping, how we are coping with the computers, what is new in the way of conservation, have we come up with some new techniques for dealing with wood and metal and plastic, what about the fugitive materials that the artists have been working with during the 50s and

60s. A period of time to be "locked in," so to speak, with IBM would be helpful to be exposed to the technology. A few weeks with the Kecks or other conservators, where they might see new resolutions to standard headache problems being worked on. Some courses in art should be pursued. There are plenty of fellowships available under the Museum Fellowship Program (NEA) which are not even applied for, because in order for a museum to grant that leave, the museum has to find a qualified person to take the position for a while. But once that's resolved, the NEA Fellowship Program is eager for such applications.

*Martin Friedman, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota*

I think it's terribly important the registrars get the sense of how vital they are. I think it's one of the most important jobs in the museum, because in their hands rests the collection, which is what we're all about. Even though there are external pressures that come in from community groups, etc., etc., we still are, basically, museums which collect. I think that the registrar's position in the whole profession should be recognized as one of the key ones. The curators get all the romance and the directors get all the administration, but it's the registrars that people think of as moles somewhere down in the cellar complaining about things, nitpicking. To the contrary, I'd say they're the center of everyday life in a museum.

*Samuel Miller, The Newark Museum, Newark, New Jersey*

It would be very helpful to have information available for registrarial functions where there is no registrar in the museum.

In-service training is very important and badly needed, and not just for registrars. What came out of the women's group at the AAM emphasized the need for training in management at many different levels of museum staff. I can't stress any more strongly the importance this holds for the field.

*R. Andrew Maass, Fresno Arts Center, Fresno, California*

Trustees are apt to set a policy regarding a museum as a curatorial institution, and as a consequence the registrar is sort of a house cleaner. There has to be a change in this view. We're coming to an advanced level of acquisition, and, even though there are still plenty of things to buy, we've amassed large collections in my museum which have probably become a tremendous burden. Before, the emphasis was on getting things into the museum and putting them on the wall, forming a collection. Now that the collections are formed, interpretive facilities are becoming more important and so are registrarial ones.

*Ralph T. Coe, Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City, Missouri*

There follows a quantitative analysis of responses in keeping with the question of protocol (see Appendix B, Protocol for Interview of Museum Directors by Telephone). It displays a collective view of

preferred qualifications and treatments for a museum registrar, along with a selection of study topics and suggestions on training. Each percentage given represents the proportion of those who made a reply or mention within that particular question, with adjusted frequencies being taken into account.

**Quantitative Analysis of Responses**

| | | % | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Question 1:* | *Registrar on Staff* | | |
| | Yes | 63 | |
| | No | 37 | |
| | | | 100 |
| *Question 2:* | *Functions* | | |
| | Not quantifiable. See interview content. | | |
| *Question 3:* | *Preferences for* | | |
| | *Levels of education* | | |
| | Master's (or graduate) | 70 | |
| | Bachelor of Arts (or Sciences) | 22 | |
| | Associate degree (Community College) | 4 | |
| | High school | 4 | |
| | | | 100 |
| | *Previous employment experience* | | |
| | Clerical | 38 | |
| | Museum (Assistant Registrar or other) | 24 | |
| | Library | 22 | |
| | Legal | 9 | |
| | Administrative | 7 | |
| | | | 100 |
| | *Temperament* | | |
| | Gets along well with people, staff or public | 35 | |
| | Meticulous, fond of detail | 31 | |
| | Steady, calm, patient | 22 | |
| | Relaxed, *not* compulsive | 6 | |
| | Object-oriented rather than people-oriented | 3 | |
| | *Not* innovative | 3 | |
| | | | 100 |
| *Question 4:* | *Topic of study* | | |
| | Storage | 28 | |
| | Packing/Shipping | 26 | |
| | Computer Processing of Information | 24 | |
| | Condition Reporting | 18 | |
| | Insurance | 4 | |
| | | | 100 |

*Question 5: Preferences for*

*Setting for Educational Program*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Museum | 38 | |
| University | 3 | |
| Combination | 59 | |
| | | 100 |

*Faculty*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Museum professionals | 32 | |
| Academic faculty | 5 | |
| Combination | 63 | |
| | | 100 |

In Question 5, most persons who stated a preference for the museum setting would like to have a mixed faculty participate.

## A Pilot Videotape on Packing and Shipping

This production is a direct outcome of the pilot survey conducted during the 1977 AAM meeting. As such, it is an essential part of the data relating to the development of educational materials for the training of museum registrars in that it provided an index to the acceptability and potential utilization of other-than-print modes of instruction and, thereby, helped to determine characteristics of the final media component to be produced in conjunction with the formal survey.

At the outset of this research project, it was not known what form either of the media components would take *i.e.,* whether the content would be produced on film or videotape, whether the production would be in the style of a documentary, a dramatization or a demonstration. However, it was predetermined that

1. the production would be experimental or exploratory in its basic approach to the study topic selected at the pilot level, level,
2. production style and techniques would depend largely upon situational factors pertaining to the facilities and exhibition schedule of Cooper-Hewitt, the "laboratory" museum collaborating in this effort,
3. if the study topic chosen through both the pilot and formal survey were to be one and the same, the final production would build upon this experimental piece of work, developing the content further and refining production techniques according to evaluations made in the process of creating the pilot component.

As previously mentioned in this report, the study topic "Packing and Shipping" was selected by museum registrars participating in the initial survey.

Soon afterward, the Registrar Associate to the project called attention to the fact that a traveling exhibition, "Two Hundred Years

of American Architectural Drawings," would be dismantled, packed and shipped from Cooper-Hewitt to another museum and that this would provide an "optimum situation" for illustrating how a museum registrar relates to other staff members and coordinates procedures during such a move.

The exhibition was co-sponsored by the American Federation of Arts (AFA) and, for this reason, there would be a registrar from the AFA staff assisting the Cooper-Hewitt staff. While this in itself was not a usual circumstance at Cooper-Hewitt during the moving of an exhibition, other aspects, according to the Registrar Associate, would typify practices in a museum and at the same time relate specifically to the selected topic. Also, there was nothing similar scheduled at the museum during the period of time set aside for this research component.

Once the decision to draw upon this activity was made, an investigation of situational factors took place to determine how the production was to be directed.

**Situational Factors**

It was learned that there would be several major constraints placed upon the production, regardless of the form of media employed.

1. Procedures for moving the exhibition were tightly planned to coincide with a day when the museum was closed to visitors and two subsequent days when galleries other than those being dismantled would be open to the public. Therefore, *there could be no interruption of activity, nor could any lighting apparatus or electrical cables be used during public hours.*

2. Throughout the procedures, most of the floor space in the galleries where work was going on would be taken up by large packing cases to be brought in by the moving company shipping the exhibition. Therefore, *there would be only a minimum amount of mobility allowable for crew and equipment.*

3. Many of the drawings in the exhibition were old, rare and subject to possible damage under the heat of strong lighting. Therefore, *only minimal candlepower for use in production was permitted.*

4. Since the exhibition was to remain in a warehouse for a period of time before leaving for its destination, and another exhibition would be immediately installed in the galleries of Cooper-Hewitt, *there would be no opportunity for retakes or inserts.*

As anticipated, these factors determined the choice of media for the pilot production, its style and content, as well as its budget.

**Production Techniques**

Content was produced in the style identified by Cross as *micro-practice, i.e.,* making a visual record of a professional procedure as it actually takes place in its own setting, without prior scripting or staging, relying upon postproduction editing for producing a cohesive unit of instructional material for training."

A three-person crew, working closely with the Project Director and Registrar Associate *in situ,* used a compact, portable assembly of ¼" color videotape equipment, maintaining basic auxiliary lighting and recording natural or *wild* sound throughout. A single camera equipped with a manually operated zoom lens photographed museum procedures as they occurred in real time, making repeated recordings of dismantling, packing and loading activities. At no time was the museum work delayed or altered for the purpose of video production."

Following a succession of screenings, the original videotape was edited according to an "afterscript" prepared by the Project Director and Registrar Associate in collaboration with advisement groups and the production company on contract to the project.[40] Hours of "raw" (unedited) content were condensed to ten minutes, making every effort to preserve a sense of real time and actual continuity within the final version. Narration was added to the natural sound, as were opening and closing musical backgrounds for titles and credits (see Appendix C, Afterscript for *When the Show Moves On*).

**Evaluative Findings**

The pilot tape was shown in unedited and final videocassettes to museum registrars and directors, museum educators and university faculty, filmmakers, broadcasters and publishers over a period of several months. To characterize their evaluations briefly would be to offer a classic producer's statement: "*The reviews are mixed. We're not sure of its box-office draw.*"

However, a more definitive statement is appropriate to this effort in that it is not a performance nor a documentary but, rather, a research component to investigate the level of acceptability for work of this kind as a training tool. A more suitable summary, in this case, is as follows:

> There were varied responses among individuals representing a variety of related professions concerning the micropractice approach to the topic. As each evaluator regarded this technique from his or her own professional stance, reactions ranged widely from highly critical to warmly enthusiastic.

Those having an especially strong concern about upgrading standards of practice for museum registrars objected vigorously to some of the methods for dismantling employed by the Cooper-Hewitt staff — none of which, as mentioned earlier, was rehearsed or staged but represented what would have been done if a production had not been

made while the exhibition was being moved. It was felt by these persons that

> a *model* series of procedures, rather than an actual working sequence, should have been produced so as to safeguard replication of less-than-ideal methods by other professionals who might be viewing the videotape for training purposes.

Selected comments follow:

> *A technical film must be as perfect as possible (according to acceptable museum practice) in demonstrated procedures.*
>
> *Personnel will follow practices demonstrated even if they are wrong.*
>
> *A training film should perhaps not depict an atypical situation such as this where the museum has no loading dock.*
>
> *The make-do methods, albeit effective in the long run, do not mirror desirable conditions for packing and shipping.*
>
> *Work was being done in extremely close quarters.*

Others, museum registrars among them, took an opposite view. These persons felt that to show what *should* be done rather than present a "real world" example could, possibly, overwhelm or defeat professionals working in smaller museums or galleries with similarly limited facilities and/or staff and that the actual sequences were more apt to encourage improvement in practices; that the pilot tape could be useful as a "springboard" teaching device for provoking lively discussion among professionals about preferable ways to adapt or modify an ideal standard to a given situation.

Selected comments follow:

> *There must be a faster way to open a packing case, but just seeing this ought to stimulate our thinking about tools and techniques that should be made available to museum staff to save time and money.*
>
> *When Burnham explained to us during the scenes of loading those cases into the Cooper-Hewitt elevator, "THIS is our loading dock," it occurred to me that we don't really know how many museums do or do not have a loading dock. This could be helpful to more institutions than we realize — to show them how to cope efficiently, despite real limitations of space.*
>
> *Illumination of specific processes at Cooper-Hewitt would seem to help others to relate to their own problems — without being "stagey" or contrived.*
>
> *It would be well to remind ourselves that the museum profession has not as yet openly declared standards of practice*

*within registrarial or other functions that would serve as a reference for a more tightly scripted production.*

Technically, the finished videotape was considered by most to be effective in respect to color values, image resolution, camera work, scripting and, particularly, postproduction editing.

Apart from how evaluators felt about the advantages and disadvantages of a model versus actual performance of museum functions, there was agreement on the following aspects:

- Procedures shown tend to be more typical of moving an exhibition from a museum than otherwise, regardless of technical or operational departures from the ideal or the presence of another registrar from an outside source.
- This pilot would be applicable to registrars newly appointed to their jobs; to supporting museum staff who assist the registrar or perform these functions without a registrar to direct operations; as an introductory vehicle within a course on museum practices; as a motivational device for a seminar/workshop on registrarial methods; as information for directors and trustees determining standards of practice for their own museums; as a means for the public to learn what goes on "behind the scenes" at a museum.
- For mid-career or more advanced museum professionals, this production would be too basic; it needs to be developed further at a later date, showing more specific, carefully performed museum practices in greater detail, yet maintaining the reality emphasis.
- Afterscripting and postproduction editing present proportionately greater costs (in view of the highly speculative nature of "reality" content) than would a pre-scripted effort using similar crew and equipment.
- Next time, museum facilities, as well as arranged planning periods with staff, should be made readily accessible for more controlled, yet more mobile, production activity.

In the meantime, it had been determined that the study topic selected by most museum registrars participating in the formal survey was "Condition Reporting." On the basis of this differential as well as upon evaluative findings from the pilot videotape, it was decided to design a different research component that would use other-than-print media in a more structured way and test further their capability to assist in the conduct of this museum function.

## A Five-Way Comparison of Media Techniques for Condition Reporting

Dudley and Wilkinson, recognized authorities on registrarial procedures, stress that the examination of objects for condition is one of the most important functions a registrar performs in a museum.[1]

Ideally, they say, every valuable piece should be photographed when first received so that this "entry photograph" may be then used as the descriptive catalogue photograph in conjunction with a verbal account of characteristics and, if observed, existing flaws. If the object shows any damage, distortion or disintegration upon arrival, a "record photograph" should be made to bring out graphically every detail of this condition, both as a guide to the conservator and as a record. In the case of damage occurring in transit, a photographic record of condition must be made to substantiate any necessary claim to the insurance company covering the shipment. With so many insurance policies now paying on the basis of "current market value as of the day of loss," it is becoming increasingly important that a condition report be available to help the museum staff arrive at the dollar value to be claimed.

Photography is acknowledged to be further supportive in the care and insurance of collections by providing a comparative record of condition before outgoing material leaves the museum. In museums without conservation departments, the inspection is frequently made by the registrar. It is to be expected that the registrar call to the attention of the curator any condition which may prejudice the safety of the object in transit. [42]

Every attempt should be made to describe three attributes of any defect: its nature, its location, its extent. There is a need for brevity and accuracy."[43]

It has already been shown through practiced use that a photograph not only substantiates the verbal aspects of such a report but also serves to offset growing problems that are being recognized by the profession at large: *There are too many different forms for condition reporting in circulation, and the terminology in use is far from precise.* In the latter respect, it is to be noted that a defect seen on an object can, in some cases, be described by four or five words — in the same language."[44]

Besides verbal descriptions, most registrars tend to use a Polaroid camera, or, if there is a photographic department in their museums, the picture needed is taken by a large format or studio camera. Otherwise, the use of photography for condition reporting by museums is limited.

In the museum field, video has become more generally accepted as an enhancement for exhibitions and program content for public television specials, but over the years there have been some informal explorations of its capabilities toward condition reports.[45]

To further support these endeavors and at the same time direct the next media component toward the selected topic, this project undertook a comparison of videotape with four other photographic techniques in a controlled process of condition reporting, using three museum pieces selected by the curator of Cooper-Hewitt from its permanent collection. The schema for this comparison is shown in Figure 2.

The purpose of this research effort was to direct attention, in a time frame within a structural variation, to the critical aspect of each

museum piece so that the chance for misinterpretation or faulty diagnosis would be minimized to the fullest extent possible.

Procedures were carried out in a classroom within the museum as assigned by the director. Production crew and equipment were provided by the Center for Instructional Development, Queens College, City University of New York, under the supervision of John Haney, Director. Members of the advisement group assisted the Registrar Associate in identifying problems of condition on each object and participated in evaluation of outcomes."

Each of the three objects was photographed in the five media formats elected for use. When all of the images were available for comparison by projection, the results were evaluated to determine the capability of each photographic technique to produce an accurate, affordable and convenient report on the condition of objects under examination.

**Evaluative Findings**

It was learned that any of the five photographic techniques employed significantly facilitates the process of condition reporting and provides substantive marginal benefits for determining the degree of defect shown on an object. However, there are practical constraints of time and cost present in some of the modes that would, under ordinary museum conditions, prompt the question: *Are these capabilities, while advantageous, necessary or affordable?* To reply specifically, each mode will be discussed briefly in relation to this five-way comparison and the condition reports it produced.

***Polaroid.*** The photographs derived from this camera are thought to be sufficient for obvious cases of damage or less critical records of items in a collection, but the resolution of image is not sufficient to accurately record, for example, areas of pitting or flaking that need to be pinpointed at a particular location. Without a portrait lens attached, the picture is murky in color and detail. It would also need to be physically attached to a written statement before it could be fully useful. A Polaroid photograph is convenient, quick and, exclusive of equipment price, costs about fifty cents, but it is insufficient to the needs of a museum with valuable holdings that go in and out frequently.

***Videocassette.*** This mode proved its practical benefit by being able to be monitored during the photographic process and played back immediately afterward in full daylight. Picture and sound are of fine, useful quality. Degrees of defect on each object were markedly clear to see. The audio track was found to be a powerful adjunct to the moving image, in that the voice of the registrar describing the nature and location of damage on each object followed the motion of the camera, directing the viewer to the portion of the image shown. This confluence of detail produced organized information and emphasized the major defects for conservation or special care in transit. An additional advantage observed by advisers was that not having to send the recording out for laboratory processing offers optimum confidentiality

concerning the report. As to cost, exclusive of equipment, a videocassette can contain over thirty consecutive images a second at a rate of fifteen to thirty cents a minute, depending upon the price of raw stock used. A substantial number of condition reports could be stored in one cassette, if they were kept brief and to the point.

***Film, 16 mm.*** Continuous photographing of images is not feasible in this mode; therefore, the process is more time consuming than video. Problem areas of damage have to be focused upon in separate shot sequences, with light meter readings taken for each. Also the registrar's commentary has to be recorded on a separate tape recorder and joined to the image at the laboratory.

Before a condition report can be projected for review, the film must be processed (three days) and edited (a week to ten days). The latter involves conforming the image to mixed sound in a composite print. Therefore, for a considerable amount of time, the condition report is out of the hands of the registrar, curator or conservator until it can be used or filed. The image and sound are not considered by viewers to be clearer than that produced by the videocassette in the given situation. Therefore, the additional cost of processing (about thirty dollars a minute) would not be warranted.

***Film, Super 8 mm.*** This mode is, perhaps, too miniscule for condition reporting. The image is less sharp than on the videocassette, and the processing, while not so long nor so involved as that of the 16 mm version, is, nevertheless, a factor of delay in reviewing the report. As to cost, this mode could be made almost as affordable as the videocassette, if a cartridge unit were employed to store reports without editing the content. A built-in sound unit might be more useful in some circumstances, but this would present a potential problem of placing the registrar near the object, whatever its location and size.

In both film modes there is no monitoring capability during production. Therefore, reports would have to be carefully planned to avoid error.

***Slide, 35 mm.*** Excellent image is produced, but the sound would have to be recorded on tape, as in this case, requiring three separate units of information to be filed concerning an object's condition. If no sound were desired, this mode would be useful and, at thirty-five cents each, affordable. To photograph various sections of an object where damage is present in variable degrees, however, would require about eight pictures to address the problem and result in a collective slide report. This mode requires careful and orderly filing, but it is one that registrars are familiar with, as the survey data show.

In summary, video offers a superior opportunity for museum registrars to combine sight and sound toward creation of a more efficient, informative way to make condition reports and safeguard collections that are in the museum or on travel.

*FIGURE 2.*

**Schema for Comparison of Photographic Techniques for Condition Reporting**

**Media Formats (in color)**

| Museum Objects | Mode 1 | Mode 2 | Mode 3 | Mode 4 | Mode 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Wallpaper fragment<br>2. Tapestry<br>3. Urn | Polaroid | Video ½" | Film, 16 mm | Film, 8 mm | Slide, 35 mm |
| **Auxiliary Equipment Used with All Modes** | **Equipment Used** | | | | |
| Turntable covered with dark felt | Automatic 250 Land<br>Zeiss Icon range finder | SONY 1800 video cassette recorder | Bolex<br>Normal (25 mm) and wide angle (9 mm) | Bolex modified<br>Normal lens (13 mm) | Pentax SP500 50 mm lens |
| Raking light (Tensor Portable A-5197, 120V, 30W) | Automatic exposure | SONY DXC 1600 color camera | lenses with closeup attach-ments | Wide angle lens (3.5 mm) closeup attach-ments | Film: Ekta-chrome Daylight 64 Ekta-chrome tungsten |
| | Portrait lens<br>No sound | Tripod<br>SONY 12" Trinitron monitor<br>Electra-Voice 635A micro-phone<br>Assorted cables | Tripod<br>Film: Ekta-chrome 72-42 ASA 125<br>1200W lamps Halogen<br>Nagra reel-to-reel audiotape recorder (not sync sound) | Tripod<br>Film: Ekta-chrome 72-45 ASA 125<br>1200W lamps Halogen<br>Nagra reel-to-reel audiotape recorder | Sound on SONY 150 tape recorder |

Note: Where motion was used, a reasonably uniform time frame was maintained for each exposure by having the Registrar Associate read the same written condition report aloud from a prepared file card.

## An Annotated Bibliography for Registrars by Registrars

The fifth component has been produced painstakingly through the combined efforts of Elizabeth Burnham, Albina De Meio, Patricia Nauert, Katherine Paris, David Vance and Anthony Wright (see list of Advisement Groups, p. 69) so as to provide a comprehensive desk reference for persons performing registrarial functions in museums. Placed in its entirety on pages 55 through 68 of this publication, this bibliography should be of immediate and regular use to many.

# V

# Summary and Conclusions

The profile of a museum registrar has features of dynamic change and growing professionalism that were shaped by the frank assessments of those who work in this capacity and from thoughtful opinions of those who employ them. It portrays how seriously the museum profession is to be regarded in the future and how sensibly its members may be encouraged to advance.

Registrars and directors are in agreement that the registrarial function is focal to the proper care and management of museum collections. They also concur that learning on the job augmented by occasional short-term workshops is no longer a sufficient means to provide a satisfactory flow of technical information or to measure individual expertise in museum practices, that other approaches to staff development are needed. Both groups favor cooperative involvement of the museum profession and academic community in offering training programs at the mid-career level, with strong preferences for seeing the teaching/learning processes take place within a museum, rather than in a university classroom or in conjunction with annual professional meetings.

Their views tend to differ, however, on what the work of a registrar entails, the style in which it is to be carried out and the subject matter most necessary to be learned.

Most directors visualize the ideal registrar at the center of day-to-day collection management, maintaining accurate, easy-to-find records and coordinating operational detail with consummate, patient skill, but, even more importantly, they look to the registrar for keeping the peace among staff members as museum work goes on.

They want a registrar who is able to cope with difficult situations and personalities straightforwardly and to do so at an appropriate level as independently of the director as possible. Yet, they generally do not seek applicants with strong administrative backgrounds. Instead, they often recruit and appoint individuals newly emerged from academic study in a scholarly discipline who have sufficient clerical skills or some basic experience in museum work.

Directors seem to appreciate the work their registrars do and advocate opportunities for them to develop their various talents and interests further. They do not, however, appear to embrace the view generally held in the world of business: that to manage well is to be more decisive than tractable; being meticulous about detailed paperwork often requires substantive training and internalized concentration far more than group consciousness. Thus, the data on traits desired in registrars form a complex, somewhat contradictory pattern

of qualifications difficult to realize in actual employment. As one director remarked, "Of course, we cannot expect too much."

Selection of the topic "Storage: Design and Methods" by directors as their first choice for advanced study by registrars reflects the importance attached to competence in what is traditionally known as the "grand housekeeping duties" in a museum. Similar emphasis on systematic order can be found in the directors' second and third choices: "Packing/Shipping" and "Cataloguing by Computer." All relate to the location and movement of objects — prime causal factors behind a director's need for a registrar on a museum's staff. The minimal interest shown among directors in encouraging the study of "Condition Reporting" suggests that they associate this topic with the responsibilities of a curator or conservator rather than with those of a registrar.

Overall, there is a mix of warm praise with conservative views concerning placement of a registrar within the organizational structure of a museum. Directors value registrars highly, depend upon them greatly, but seem to be hoping that, even though registrars may learn more about museum work, they will be content to pour their newly developed expertise back into the role as it is still perceived by the majority of these administrators: a service-oriented position with less status and lower salary than can be found at the level of curator or conservator, yet one increasingly pressured by the day-to-day demands of museum operations.

Some directors differ from the majority on what they look for in a registrar. They stress the value of linking this position more overtly with the work of the conservator or, as in several interesting examples, changing the title and elevating the position to an administrative level that brings the incumbents to regular staff meetings and involves them on par with the traditionally recognized management team in discussion or decision concerning museum policy and procedures.

This latter perspective on the role of museum registrar appears to be more in keeping with the profile that registrars are outlining for themselves. They see themselves as more outgoing and eager to extend their duties and responsibilities into broader areas of museum practice than most directors are inclined to envision.

Despite the fact that many of them are relatively young and not too long out of college, a substantial number have already participated in certificate and non-degree programs directed toward their professional development. This suggests a personal, yet strongly collective appetite for learning that is far from typical in the museum profession. Registrars are evidently willing to combine work and study to make it possible for them to become more responsive to museum needs — a generalizable trait that bears special attention.

The functions they perform hold in 14 instances sufficient commonality among museums of all types to comprise a nucleus of subject matter for an advanced course of study on the work of a registrar that could be offered on a nationwide basis. Other staff members performing these same functions in museums without a registrar would benefit as well.

The registrars' choice of "Condition Reporting" as the main topic for study demonstrates a sincere interest in becoming more proficient in the care of museum objects, while also recognizing a practical need for having expertise and authority that overlap into areas of museum practice which have for some time been the domains of curator and conservator.

Their relative indifference to "Cataloging by Computer" is in sharp contrast to the emphasis placed upon this topic by directors. It is not clear from the data why this is so. However, one sees in their preference for the textbook (as a mode for learning more about this subject) a tentative curiosity that may motivate additional research to pinpoint the degree of willingness among registrars to include study of the computer in a curriculum.

In general, preferences for ways to learn at a professional level are highly conservative among registrars. A marked tendency toward selecting the textbook, lecture and demonstration for study implies that most registrars prefer to pursue their education in exactly the same ways by which they were taught in previous years. Modest exceptions to this, indicated by a higher interest in videotape relative to study of "Condition Reporting" and "Storage: Design and Methods," may reflect recent experimentation by registrars in these areas. These responses may, in fact, be precursors of a greater acceptance of video than this study has been able to reveal. For the present, however, it can be concluded that the use of other-than-print media for continuing education of museum registrars is not regarded highly enough by museum registrars to warrant the effort and the expense required for production of instructional materials in this form.

This is not to say that this conclusion excludes the use of video in other ways. The formal comparison made in this study shows that the medium is significantly effective as a tool for operational purposes within the registrar's department. Its use in safeguarding museum objects could be readily expanded.

The process of exploring each of the five components designed for study has produced a thorough understanding of museum registrars. They are vibrantly dissatisfied with their role, their range of authority and the working situations they supervise, as well as with other professional circumstances they encounter. They view themselves as overworked and underpaid, but at the same time, they are fiercely loyal to museum work and, as a commercial slogan puts it, "would rather fight than switch." They want more recognition and more education; most, however, are not sure whether their museums would underwrite the cost of development programs for them.

In expressing their educational needs and interests, most registrars lean more toward administrative and diagnostic concerns about objects than toward scholarly study of them, thereby relating themselves less closely to the curator and more directly toward the director or the conservator. Many feel it is essential to know more about both of these areas of museum practice so as to be able to facilitate and support other staff members, as daily situations might require.

Advancement of the registrar's function is not a movement to displace or modify established roles in museums. Rather, registrars have, by necessity, been reshaping and strengthening an essential and discrete role during this past decade of increased acquisition and exhibition by museums. It has been a gradual, self-generated process which has transformed their identity through a "grey area" of loosely defined professionalism from that of a "secretary-librarian type" of employee to one in which they are now expected to relate to people and objects with concomitant ease and authority. The registrar's job today is less behind the catalogue files and more in the center of museum operations. As such it appears to be pointed in a new and more realistic direction. However, in the process of such changes, registrars have found themselves needing and wanting more learning, more recognition and, indeed, more support for upgrading the quality of their work.

It may be necessary for some museum directors to broaden their views on what a registrar is and does before they would enthusiastically approve substantial investment of time by those essential employees for the development of administrative and/or scholarly skills in museum management.

Additional persuasion may be found in a conclusion that the earlier study, *Museums, USA,* has been correct in placing the registrar within the administrative category of museum jobs rather than in curatorial/display. According to the findings brought together to produce this profile, that is where the registrar seems to belong — especially as this position is increasingly considered central to the management of collections.

Museum registrars are in a potentially strategic position to become, in due time, a "new breed" of museum directors. As an index population for this study, registrars have shown themselves to be a substantial group of potential enrollees for future training programs in museum practice.

Museum directors have generously contributed time and thought in conveying their own perceptions of this museum position. In conjunction with these, their creative suggestions concerning how registrars as well as others of the museum profession might be taught deserve conclusive mention.

In the combination setting of museum/university that is favored by more than half of the directors, there would have to be a broad curriculum, they say, to satisfy the practicing museum professional. They felt, however, that only the most dedicated of employees would be willing to attend more than one session of a course per week, regardless of content. In a course of this kind, a mixed faculty would be strongly preferred, *i.e.,* museum professional, academic faculty member and a representative from a business associated with museum practices. To maintain a high level of interest as well as attendance, the instructional materials and method would, of necessity, be well designed and varietally presented. It is important, many contend, that the museum selected for this training program be well-equipped and

easily accessible. No particular mention has been made about the composition of enrollment — whether classes should be held exclusively for one group of staff members or be open to those interested in the subject matter being taught.

Although directors placed considerable emphasis upon the fellowship as a viable alternative to a formal course of study, some said that funds for fellowships available to the museum profession often go without being awarded, because there are not enough persons who can be released from their regular employment to take advantage of the opportunity.

Some directors noted that their museums have developed special expertise in cataloging by computer, storage design and photographic techniques and expressed an inclination to share this knowledge with staff members from other museums. No specific plan was suggested, but the possibilities are left open for further consideration.

A proposal was made that a broader, and yet more intensive, survey be conducted on the needs of other professionals in museum work, one that would also take into account the available assets in the field for more effective training in specific areas such as condition reporting and restoration.

Data gathered through interviewing museum directors largely substantiate the registrars' own views that they are greatly appreciated by their employers. A conclusive evaluation of the way both components interacted to produce this main effect is that perhaps the project did not go deeply enough into the matter of professional relationships within the working situation for even further information on this aspect of self-concept *vis-a-vis* the concept of others. Additional inquiry into how registrars are regarded by other members of the museum staff (*i.e.,* curator and/or conservator) or by the profession at large (*i.e.,* officers or committee members within a professional organization, registrars employed at other museums) might have made it possible to find out why registrars have for some time been thought to view themselves as being only on the fringe of acceptance as museum professionals.

Threading throughout most of the interviews is an ambiguity of standards and needs not unlike that expressed by the governing boards of major museums when they seek new directors: *Should the applicant selected be someone knowledgeable about subject matter pertaining to the collections, should the person chosen be someone who understands how to handle the daily business of a museum or is it reasonable to expect to find both kinds of qualifications in the same individual?* The staff level may be different, but it appears that the dilemma is the same.

Smaller museums, some directors emphasized, cannot reach a twofold solution to management problems at any level of organizational structure or salary. Oftentimes, this results in the director's holding a double job and, in turn, wanting to have a double one done by others on the staff. For these institutions, the problem is additionally magnified by the lack of definition that persists in respect to museum work.

Here and there in the interviews are vestiges of the concern about university/museum relationships noted in the first section of this report. References were made to the fact that interaction between these two worlds of education still leaves much to be desired, but, for the most part, comments were more reflective than critical. Underlying all remarks is an evident thrust toward productive collaboration.

During the course of this project, similar outreaches toward increased collaboration among museums and universities, as well as government agencies, were observable at meetings held in the United States and Canada.

At the Northeast Regional meeting of the AAM, particularly, there was a strong desire expressed for having a more clearly established network of information and resources on museum training. Such a network, proposed Robert Wells, would encourage the study of other models in career development so as to investigate alternative means for increasing technical expertise in museum practice. [47]

In an address to conference members, Paul Perrot urged a "total willingness to share," adding that "unless the museum profession accepts responsibility for its own interdisciplinarity, the true hailstones of government will beat us into it." Acknowledging that in the United States there is no national museum system, as in Canada, Perrot observed that, nonetheless, there is a redefining of services as well as identity.[48]

> For some time, it has been hard for our museums to admit that we are a profession . . . We've been lax in defining what we are, what it is that we need, and what the directions are that we must take . . . but there are pressures now leading us into new relationships between ourselves and the rest of the world . . . We, as a profession, must come to grips with all of these factors or other agencies will . . . For development of training programs, there must be interchange of personnel and an effort made to avoid duplication and overlap of funding as well as ideas . . . We have to concentrate our efforts . . . It is this laxity which I feel is so threatening . . . If we build up from inside, develop a true, cooperative spirit, then these truths are all interlinked . . . Then we are all part of a collective family — ingoing to pierce, outgoing to illuminate more broadly . . . There should also be a symbiotic relationship with academe, for museums need the stimulus of the academic . . . We must consider more strongly than ever before the matter of sabbatical leave (at all levels and between academic and working museum personnel), as to how to effect an exchange this way as to whether or not the job would really be there when one came back . . .

These words reflect an observable change of dynamics and spirit among museum professionals which provides extra motivation for making the recommendations that follow.

# VI

# Recommendations

> When people ask for education, they normally mean something more than mere training, something more than mere knowledge of facts, and something more than mere diversion. Maybe they cannot themselves formulate precisely what they are looking for; but I think what they are really looking for is ideas that would make the world, and their own lives, intelligible to them. When a thing is intelligible, you have a sense of participation; when a thing is unintelligible, you have a sense of estrangement. "Well, I don't know," you hear people say, as an important protest against the unintelligibility of the world as they meet it . . . What, then, is education? It is the transmission of ideas which enable man to choose between one thing and another.
>
> E. F. Schumacher
> *Small is Beautiful: Economics As If People Mattered, 1973."*

For employers and educators — and fortunately for the museum profession as well — the 1970s have emerged as a time when a serious attention is being given to quality of worklife and the relationship between work and education. Increasingly, people are not looking upon their employment as a matter of having to work to survive. The national focus in higher education, therefore, is upon encouraging people to become prepared for work that is interesting, personally satisfying and properly recognized. The concern is not psychologically oriented *per se;* rather it is thought that within this concern we have a *potential* economic crisis that could, if we do not take steps to avoid it, shake us to our roots.[50] There is a need for consolidation of organizational effort at the same time there is a cry for particularization of skill and talent in many a profession. Continuing education is offered for advancement, and as Adele Scheele and others advise, should be the kind which "promotes a range of behavior that allows mature students to have the working life they want while performing the work that is expected of them."[51]

To a greater extent than was, perhaps, originally conceived, the study of museum registrars as a potential model for advancing professionalism within museums is part of an increasing flow of emphasis upon relating work and education in observable, more generally beneficial ways.[52] It is within this context that the following recommendations have been developed.

**Recommendation 1**

*More research should be undertaken on museum training.*

This is a familiar recommendation which may cause some persons to impulsively react with, "What? Yet another study? What we need instead is action — programs that result in constructive change."

It is, indeed, action-oriented research that is needed — research which will lead to productive results and applied programs. For example:

- More must be known about the structuring of the various roles and functions within a museum staff and related community services to determine how both may be encouraged to interact and overlap so as to improve the care and management of collections without psychologically encroaching upon personal values and professional goals of individuals working together.
- There must be further definition established for training requirements at all levels, with more attention given to those presently employed rather than to those relatively uninitiated to the museum profession. Comparative study as well as practicum laboratory effort may be required to determine where or when teaching/learning experiences may be effectively shared and why programs of study should be intentionally exclusive for one group or another.
- Exploration of the potential roles of museums, institutions of higher learning and professional associations should be intensively directed toward creating more effective programs that would draw powerfully upon each resource's unique ability to interpret the museum profession to potential students, whether at entry or mid-career level.
- Model training programs of various lengths and methodologies should be replicated when found to be successful during initial presentation. These should be made available in original and replicated forms for formative and summative evaluation, with demonstrations and critiques made a central focus of organizational meetings and conferences on museum training. Criteria for training programs should be modified accordingly as these procedures provide new information.

**Recommendation 2**

*A larger quantity of training materials more relevant to the needs of museums should be created. These should be produced with a major degree of participation by museum professionals but should also involve more substantially the efforts and resources of major*

*publishers. These materials would be planned in close collaboration, rather than in competition, with individual authors and professional associations that have already demonstrated a firm interest in this type of publication.*

Very little can be done toward improving training programs until more instructional texts and, especially, more prepared materials on technical procedures are made.

For working reference, many available texts and mediated study units are less useful to persons who have been employed in museums for more than five years. The practicing learner, whether independently engaged in study or enrolled in a group program, needs new publications that would include (1) short-term bulletins from legal and commercial sources that would resemble "trade news," such as those found in the fields of merchandising or broadcasting; (2) self-instructional packages to be used independently or in a formal course of study, complete with project assignments that could be evaluated by a mentor, along with standardized tests to be given at selected locations; (3) individualized curricular plans for college-based study or advanced technical practice at a campus museum; (4) topical modules for study with designated readings and projects adaptable to small or large group seminars that could be conducted in museums or conference rooms.

In brief, materials should be designed to make optimum use of the participants' practical experience and to fit the intended setting and scope of resources. Unless a sufficient investment is made in the production and distribution of such materials, the creation of alternative modes for museum training would inevitably become indistinguishable from what is already available and too often presented inadequately."

**Recommendation 3**

*Study Centers for Museum Professionals should be established to facilitate a merging of resources to be found in museums, educational institutions and agencies, as well as in professional associations.*

It is increasingly acknowledged in the museum profession that while the professional associations and some universities have progressed within their respective domains toward developing and offering museum training and programs of scholarly merit and practical worth, professional development — its ways and means, its efforts and contributions — is too highly fractionated today. A little and a lot have been done by one unified force or another, but all of it added together is only relatively significant or minimally collaborative. No great advancement can be expected unless there is a consolidation of resources built upon an aggregation of expertise, programs and materials.

A logical first step would be to create a model of such a Study Center which could serve regional and, to a limited extent, national

needs of museums. This Center should, with logistical as well as political ease, draw upon diverse groups of institutions and individuals in the area. Access to the area's libraries and museum collections should be generously provided. Later, other Centers could be established to function more directly, if need be, in relation to regional requirements for personnel training.

Such Centers, of whatever size or wherever located, should be "free standing," that is, unaffiliated with a particular museum, professional organization, college or university, yet empowered and encouraged to draw upon these entities and to in turn strengthen their own programs of effort to the fullest possible extent.

Forms of sponsorship for these Study Centers should be explored, considering such alternatives as (1) a federal and state agency; (2) a private foundation; (3) a regional or public agency; (4) a consortium of museums; (5) a regional consortium of colleges and universities; (6) feasible combinations of these.

**Recommendation 4**

*More technical assistance in planning, organizational development, financial management, staff development, etc., should be obtained by museums to assist them in delineating their long- and short-term objectives in respect to the advancement of professionalism at all levels of personnel.*

Too little attention has been given to relating the problems of museum management to similar problems in the fields of law and medicine, dentistry and nursing. Some say that this is because those in the museum profession, overall, number fewer than 10,000 at the present time, that job opportunities are minimal and that salaries are not comparable to these other professions in most instances. This, however, fails to acknowledge that analogous problems need not necessarily be solved by looking only toward institutions or groups of similar size or number.[14]

Committee members of professional associations could, for example, obtain the dual benefit of advice and extrastructural knowledge by turning to the American Society for Association Executives (ASAE). The ASAE can be considered an association of associations. It reports on many educational activities of its member associations, 39 percent of which provide certification for their own members, and is, therefore, in a position to advise professional associations on how to develop certification programs to meet their particular goals.[15]

**Recommendation 5**

*The use of videotape (in color) for operational purposes in museums should be explored as exhaustively and practically as possible in the immediate future, especially in the functional areas of condition reporting.*

Although the videocassette is not highly regarded by museum registrars as an instructional format, it is receiving attention among them for making photographic records of objects as these move in and out of the museums where they work. At present, not enough is known about adapting this technology to the needs of registrars, curators and conservators. Nor is there sufficient information about the availability of equipment in the museum or the willingness of other community-based resources (broadcasting and cable companies, libraries, school systems) to provide equipment or facilities for museum use. Not enough has been determined about how knowledgeable staff members are concerning the operation of video equipment or the playback of recorded content within a functional setting. Purchase and maintenance costs should be investigated, and the information made widely available through preparation of a booklet on utilization and cost effectiveness of the videocassette for museums.

It is further recommended that available videocassette content on condition reporting be collected and evaluated in order to make known its acceptability for this purpose and encourage desirable standards for its use.

This project has involved a significant number of museum personnel in a series of activities and motivated dynamic interaction among them and with the project staff. The recommendations respectfully put forth are intended to encourage other efforts in research and decision-making that will bring educators and museum professionals even more productively together in the future.

# VII

# Annotated Bibliography

## General References

*American Association for State and Local History Directory.*

*American Association for State and Local History - Technical Leaflets.* An excellent series of reprinted articles from the monthly publication *History News* dealing with all phases of museum practice from cataloging to exhibit production. In addition to the articles, the suggested references for further reading are very helpful. A listing of the available and reasonably priced leaflets can be obtained from AASLH, 1315 Eighth Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Brown, R.W.: *Composition of Scientific Words.* Baltimore: Reese Press, 1956.

Burcaw, G.E.: *Introduction to Museology.* Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Museum, 1972. (Presents a basic philosophy giving one a view of the entire museum picture.)

Burnham, G.: *The Protection of Cultural Property: Handbook of National Legislation.* Tunisia: Ceres Productions (International Council on Museums), 1974. (Summarizes national laws for the protection of cultural property, which relate to the problem of illicit destruction of cultural heritage.)

Clapp, A.F.: *Curatorial Care of Works of Art on Paper.* Oberlin: The Intermuseum Laboratory, 1974 (A technically specific work dealing with the identification of problems involved in the conservation of paper, conservation processes and laboratory procedures.)

Davies, P. (editor): *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.* New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1960.

*Directory of Canadian Museums (Repertoire des Musees Canadiens)* Ottawa: CMA 1976, 151 pp. The most complete listing of Canadian museums and related institutions ever published. Includes all non-profit museums and art galleries, as well as government departments and agencies and associations. Each entry lists the director and senior staff, activities and hours open to the public, as well as complete address and telephone number.

Doloff, F. and R. Perkinson: *How to Care for Works of Art on Paper.* Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1971. (A basic explanation of the nature of paper and an enumeration of the fundamentals of preservation, including framing and matting.)

Emery, I.: *The Primary Structures of Fabrics: An Illustrated Classification.* Washington, D.C.: The Textile Museum, 1966.

Fall, F.K.: *Art Objects, Their Care and Preservation.* La Jolla: L. McGilvery, 1973. (A primer for the care and handling of a work of art.)

Feldman, F. and S.E. Weil: *Art Works: Law, Policy, Practice.* New York: Practicing Law Institute, 1974. (A discussion of law as it relates to works of art.)

*Forms Analysis.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Records and Management, 1960.

*Forms Design.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Records and Management, 1960.

Genoways, H.H. and M.H. McGaugh: "Federal Regulations Pertaining to Collection, Import, Export and Transportation of Scientific Specimens of Mammals." *Journal of Mammalogy* (supplement), vol. 57, No. 2, 1976.

Genoways, H.H. and M.H. McGaugh: "State Laws as They Pertain To Scientific Collection Permits." *Museology,* No. 2 Lubbock: Texas Tech Press, 1976.

Gould, D.A.: *Crate Specifications.* Washington, D.C. Smithsonian Institution Travelling Exhibition Service, 1975.

Guldbeck, P.: *The Care of Historical Collections.* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1972. (Written to provide small historical societies with an introduction to the problems of conservation and what can safely be done by the serious amateur.)

Hall, R.E.: *Collecting and Preparing Study Specimens of Vertebrates.* University of Kansas, Miscellaneous Publication No. 30, 1962. (Profides a good background on this subject for cataloguing purposes.)

Hodges, H.: *Artifacts: An Introduction to Early Materials and Technology.* London: John Baker Publishers, Ltd., 1964. (A basic book on basic materials from which artifacts (objects) are made. Text focuses on the technology and analysis of pottery, glass, metals, wood, leather, bone and adhesives. Useful from the cataloguing and conservation perspectives.)

*Income Tax Deduction for Contribution.* Publication 526. Washington, D.C.: IRS, Department of the Treasury. (Revised annually.)

Keck, C.K.: *A Handbook on the Care of Paintings.* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1965. (Basic enough for the beginner, the title is self-explanatory.)

Mayer, R.: *The Artist's Handbook of Materials and Techniques,* third edition. New York: Viking Press, 1970. (Written for the artist to provide an account of materials and methods which have been and are currently employed by artists.)

*Museums of the World.* New York: R.R. Bowker & Company, 1973.

Pink, M.: *How to Catalogue Works of Art.* Century City: Museum Systems, 1972.

Plenderleith, H.J.: *The Conservation of Antiquities and Works of Art.* Oxford University Press, 1969. (Focused mainly toward the conservation of objects, but quite helpful in identifying technological processes of manufacture and in cataloging.)

*Rand McNally Road Atlas (United States, Canada, and Mexico.)*

Risk Management Manuals I and II. New York: Association of Art Museum Directors. (Deals with problems of museum insurance;

basically a collection of articles which have been printed and published elsewhere.)

Sandison, H.: *The Visual Artist and the Law.* San Francisco: Bay Area Lawyers for the Arts, 1975.

Savage, G.: *The Art and Antique Restorer's Handbook: A Dictionary of Materials and Processes Used in the Restoration and Preservation of All Kinds of Works of Art.* New York: Frederic Praeger, 1968. (Supplies a multitude of definitions for conditions and techniques.)

Schenk, E.T. and J.H. McMasters: *Procedure in Taxonomy.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1956.

Stout, G.: *The Care of Pictures.* New York: Dover Publications, 1975. (Addressed to the person responsible for the safekeeping of pictures; an introduction to problems in their care.)

*Summary of Information for Shippers of Household Goods.* Washington, D.C.: Interstate Commerce Commission.

*The Official Museum Directory, The American Association of Museums.* Skokie: National Register Publishing Company, 1976.

Thomson, G.: *London Conference on Museum Climatology.* London: The International Institute for Conservation, 1968.

U.S. Postal Service booklets summarizing types of service, rates, and regulations.

*Valuation of Donated Property.* Publication 561. Washington, D.C.: IRS, Department of the Treasury. (Revised annually.)

Zigrosser, C. and C.M. Gaehde: *A Guide to the Collecting and Care of Original Prints,* New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1966.

## Books on Automation and Computerization

Brill, R.C.: *The TAXIR Primer,* second edition. Ann Arbor: Computing Center, University of Michigan, 1975, 151 pp. (Technical system description and application manual for the TAXIR system, widely used for museum cataloguing.)

Chenhall, Robert G.: *Museum Cataloging in the Computer Age* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975, 261 pp. (The standard work in its field. Indispensable. Discussions of individual systems, in Chapter y, are outdated in detail although not in broad outline.)

Chenhall, Robert G.: *Nomenclature for Museum Cataloguing: A System for Classifying Man-Made Objects.* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1978, 512 pp. (A pioneering attempt to standardize the naming of man-made objects through strict application of a single rationale in all cases. 474 pages devoted to suggested terms, definitions and cross references. The system is open ended.)

Dudley, Dorothy H. and Irma Wilkinson: *Museum Registration Methods,* third edition, Washington, D.C.: in preparation. American Association of Museums. (Section on computer applications includes an introduction to terms and concepts by David Vance, a

description of the REGIS application by Holly M. Chaffee, a description of an art museum cataloging project by Therese Varveris and a description of a history museum application by Carole E. Rush. The second edition is outdated with respect to computerization.

Humphrey, Philip S. and Ann C. Clausen: *Automated Cataloguing for Museum Collections: A Model for Decision and a Guide to Implementation.* Lawrence: Association for Systematics Collections, 1976, 79 pp. (The most coherent examination of cost projection to date. Of general interest even though directed primarily at application of the SELGEM system in a natural history museum.)

IBM: *Computers in the Museum,* White Plains: International Business Machines Corp., 1973, 69 pp., bibliography. (Text by David Vance, with parts supplied by IBM staff. Of interest today primarily for its extensive bibliography. Order by number GE-20-0406.)

IBM: *Introduction to Computers in the Humanities,* White Plains: International Business Machines Corp., 1971, 76 pp., bibliography. (A general layman's introduction to data processing in the humanities. No longer current in detail. Order by number GE-20-0382.)

Manning, Anita: *Data Retrieval Without a Computer.* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975. Technical Leaflet No. 85, 8 pp. (An application using mechanical data processing machinery at relatively small cost, concerned in part with control of massive, long-term loans for study among natural history museums.)

MCBC: *Museum Data Bank Research Reports,* Rochester: Museum Data Bank Committee. (Each report separately bound. The titles are self-explanatory in most cases. Several reports of minor interest to registrars are omitted from the following list.)

Chenhall, Robert G.: *The Onomastic Octopus,* report No. 10, 1977, 15 pp.

Rush, Carole E.: *An Information System for History Museums,* report No. 11, 1977, 21 pp.

Scholtz, Sandra C.: *A Management Information System Design for a General Museum,* report No. 12, 1976, 15 pp.

Scholtz, Sandra C.: *Data Structures and Computerized Museum Catalogs,* report No. 2, 1974, 8 pp.

Sutton, John F. and Craig D. Black: *Data in Systematics Collections,* report No. 6, 1975, 6 pp.

Vance, David: *What are Data?,* report No. 1, 1974, 10 pp.

MCN: *Manual for Museum Computer Network Data Preparation* Stony Brook: Museum Computer Network, 1975. Part One, text by David Vance, 30 pp. Part Two, Definition of data categories recognized by MCN, 76 pp. (Instructions for preparing data input to the GRIPHOS system followed by definitions for some 430 categories of information found to be in current use for recording museum objects, motion pictures, archaeological and historical sites, buildings and biographies. About 100 additional categories have since been identified and defined but not published.)

Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York: *Computers and Their Potential Applications in Museums* New York: Arno Press, 1968, 422 pp. (Papers read and transcripts of open discussion at a conference sponsored by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, April 15-17, 1968. This was the first general gathering of the museum profession to decide what might be done with computers. Some participants already had research results to report. Others speculated about a near future which is now the recent past. Very important as history. (Authors of papers too numerous to list.)

Neff, Jeffrey M. and Holly M. Chaffee: "REGIS — A Computerized Museum Registration System." *Curator,* Vol. 20, No. 1, March 1977, pp. 32-41. (REGIS is perhaps the only computer system designed for registration work, other than cataloguing, *e.g.,* automatic generation of incoming and outgoing receipts.)

Neuner, A.M.: *SELGEM Manual* and *SELGEM Workbook* Lawrence: Association of Systematics Collections, 1976, manual, 111 pp., workbook, 58 pp. (Teaching materials: a matched textbook and workbook for application of basic portions of the SELGEM system in a museum.)

Vance, David: *GRIPHOS* Stony Brook: Museum Computer Network, Inc., 1977, 60 pp., 54 text figures. (Not an operating manual but a general description of the concepts, principles and capabilities of GRIPHOS, illustrated by diagram.)

Vance, David: "Museum Data Banks." *Information Storage and Retrieval,* Vol. 5, 1970, pp. 203-211. (General discussion of the subject as seen before the fact.)

## Books on Conservation

Alsford, Denis B.: *An Approach to Museum Security* Ottawa: CMA, 1975, 12 pp. (An illustrated account of security considerations for museums, environmental conditions, external security, interior security, locks, security staff, curatorial security, fire and flood protection, bibliography.)

Anderson, Linda and Marcia R. Collins: *Libraries for Small Museums,* second edition. Columbia: Museum of Anthropology, 1975, 48 pp. (Results from the museum's experience in organizing a library on a shoestring budget. Basic library handbook for the small museum.)

Andre, Jean-Michel: *The Restorer's Handbook of Ceramics and Glass.* Toronto: Van Nostrand, 1976, 129 pp. (Cloth bound) (The author describes in detail the various steps of the restorer's job, cleaning fractures, piecing together jigsaw puzzles of fragments using various methods of gluing and, finally, retouching the surface and the glazes. Includes a brief glossary, a list of materials and equipment used and a classification of types of pottery.)

Bachman, Karl Werner: *Conservation During Temporary Exhibitions (La Conservation Durant les Expositions Temporaires).* Rome: ICC, 1975, 46 pp. (It frequently happens that works of art end up in

restoration workshops after being displayed in exhibitions. This book outlines various preventive measures: lighting, security, air conditioning, transport.)

Brown, James W.: *A V Instruction: Technology, Media and Methods,* fourth edition. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1973, 585 pp. (Cloth bound) (Considerations in selecting, using, producing and evaluating audio-visual educational media. Step-by-step illustrated guides to operating equipment. Sources of equipment supplies, publications, etc.)

Clapp, Anne F.: *Curatorial Care of Works of Art on Paper,* second edition, rev. Oberlin: ICA, 1974, 107 pp., ill.(Section I — Factors Potentially Harmful to Paper: environment, interior climate, the effects on paper. Section II — Procedures: examination, unframing and unmatting, cleaning, mending, matting and framing, case design and storage. Section III — The Space and Furniture for the Care of Paper.)

Dollot, Francis W. and Roy L. Perkinson: *How to Care for Works of Art on Paper.* Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 1971, 46 pp. (A basic explanation of the nature of paper and an enumeration of the fundamentals of preservation, including framing and matting.)

Duckett, Kenneth W.: *Modern Manuscripts: A Practical Manual for Their Management, Care and Use* Nashville: AASLH, 1975, 375 pp. ill. (Cloth bound) (Concerned with the practical and technical aspects of the management of manuscript collections. Duties of the job are described, including, among other topics, the mechanics and ethics of acquisitions, physical care and conservation, establishment of bibliographic control and uses of the collection.)

Gettens, Rutherford J. and George L. Stout: *Painting Materials: A Short Encyclopedia* New York: Dover, republication of 1942 edition, 333 pp. (A reference work for museum curators and conservators. Mediums, adhesives and film substances; pigments and inert materials, solvents, dilutents and detergents; supports tools and equipment.

Grierson, Philip: *Numismatics* London: Oxford University Press, 1975, 211 pp. (The study of coins and coinlike objects is an important auxiliary science of history, providing information that is not always obtainable from written documents. This book explains in terms intelligible to the general reader as well as to the coin collector the historical and technical background to coinage, how coins are studied and what the numismatists can hope to find out from them.)

Guldbeck, Per E.: *The Care of Historical Collections: A Conservation Handbook for the Nonspecialist* Nashville: AASLH, 1973, 160 pp. (The health and safety of collections; storage, security, fire protection, environment, packing. Preliminaries to conservation, documentation, the workshop and its use. First aid for artifacts, paper, leather, wood, metal objects, textiles, ceramics, glass, bone and stone.

Horton, Carolyn: *Cleaning and Preserving Bindings and Related Materials,* second edition, rev. Chicago: ALAL, 1969, 87 pp., ill. (Detailed and authoritative information necessary for unskilled people to perform conservation activities. Tells how to identify the problems as well as treat them. Lists supplies, equipment and their sources.)

Kane, Lucille M.: *A Guide to the Care and Administration of Manuscripts,* second edition, Nashville: AASLH, 1966, 74 pp. (Designed as an introduction for novices in the profession. Incorporates references to microfilms.)

Keck, Caroline: *A Handbook on the Care of Paintings,* Nashville: AASLH, 1965, 136 pp. (Essential requirements for an initial survey of paintings, anatomy of paintings, laboratory examination and treatment, conservation priorities and procedures.)

Keck, Caroline K.: *Safeguarding Your Collection in Travel* Nashville: AASLH, 1970, 78 pp. ( A concise description of the individual physical characteristics and the individual protective requirements of historic and artistic works, combined with the basic principles governing security for an object in transit.

Keck, Caroline, *et al.: A Primer on Museum Security* Cooperstown, NY: NYSHA, 1966, 85 pp. (Contents, physical security, insurance, environmental security, light and its effect on museum objects, other security factors, and some practical advice; selective bibliography and other aids.)

Key, Archie F.: *Beyond Four Walls: The Origins and Development of Canadian Museums* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974, 384 pp. (Traces the history of Canadian museums from early colonial times to the present and predicts the role of these fast-changing institutions in the next decade.)

Lee, Sherman E.: *An Understanding of Art Museums* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975, 212 pp. (Examines the aims, tasks, problems and future of art museums. Problems such as "deaccessioning" the international art market, the representative — or nonrepresentative — nature of governing boards, demands for accountability to the public and the spending of large amounts of money for major purchases.

McCracken, Jane: *Oral History: Basic Techniques, Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature, 1974,* 20 pp. (Organization of the project, the topic, the research for it and the interview process are all discussed step by step. Includes a note on recommended tape recorders.)

Phillimore E.: *A Glossary of Terms Useful in Conservation* Ottawa: CMA, 1976, 45 pp. (A comprehensive listing of conservation terms for nonconservators containing term origins, definitions and applications. Includes a valuable listing of glossary terms under their appropriate field headings and a supplement on reporting the condition of antiquities.)

Plenderleith, H.J. and A.E.A. Werner: *The Conservation of Antiquities and Works of Art: Treatment, Repair and Restoration,*

second edition, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1971, 394 pp. (Cloth bound.) (A compendium of authoritative information for collectors, archaeologists, museum curators and gallery directors. All processes described have been fully tested.)

Pomerantz, Louis: *Is Your Contemporary Painting More Temporary Than You Think? Vital Technical Information for the Present Day Artist.* Chicago: IBC, 1962, 62 pp., ill. (Emphasizes the need for sound craftsmanship by artists to ensure a long lifespan for their works. Defines the responsibilities of the art dealer and art collector.)

Potter, David M. and Bernard P. Corbman: *Textiles: Fiber to Fabric.* Toronto: McGraww-Hill, fifth edition, 1967, 495 pp. (Cloth bound) (Places stress on the comparison, selection, usage and care of fabrics, as well as on the theory and processes underlying thier manufacture and development. This textbook covers natural animal and vegetable fibers and also the man-made cellulosic, polymer, metallic, mineral, rubber and azion fibers.)

Rodd, John: *Repairing and Restoring Antique Furniture.* Toronto: Van Nostrant, 1976, 240 pp. (Cloth bound) (Rodd divides the work of restoration into six basic steps — dismantling, cleaning joints, restoring components, gluing up, levelling and sandpapering, colouring and polishing — and deals with the problems of each in turn. More specialized aspects are also discussed — chair repair, carcase and drawer work; veneer, marquetry and inlay, straightening warped wood, use of adhesives, metal fittings, etc.)

Tyler, Barbara and Victoria Dickenson: *A Handbook for the Travelling Exhibitionist* (Despite its plain brown wrapper, it may be read and used by all ages and particularly by those planning a circulating exhibition. It attempts to guide the reader through all stages of exhibition production from planning to circulation and beyond, with an emphasis on both forethought and hindsight.)

## Books on Museum Registration

Choudhury, A.R.: *Art Museum Documentation and Practical Handling.* New Delhi: Museum Research Bureau, 1963. (Along the same lines as the work of Dudley and Wilkinson, but an international version.)

Dudley, Dorothy H. and Irma B. Wilkinson, *et al.: Museum Registration Methods,* third edition, Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1978. (The standard reference book for registrars or those performing registrar functions)

Nauert, P. (editor): *Registration Techniques.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Museum Associates, 1975.

Reibel, Daniel B.: *Registration Methods for the Small Museum.* Nashville: American State and Local History, 1978 160 pp. (Paperback) (Although the author stresses that this book is primarily for small history museums, the content is faithful to its title. All museums of small or moderate size should welcome this helpful technical book

by a curator who is cognizant of as well as sympathetic to the need for a more uniform registration system. It does not talk down; it talks *to* the registrar or anyone else whose job it is to keep all of those records straight. Keep it near.)

## Additional Selections by Title

*Manual for Fire Protection for Archives and Record Centers* (No. 232 AM) Boston: 1972, 26 pp. Supplement to: Standard for the Protection of Records, 1970. (Fire retardent treatments, fire control systems, fire detection methods. Discussion and comparison of fire extinguishing systems, as well as their installation and maintenance. Specimen specification for fire-safe construction of archives and record centers.)

*Manual for Museums,* by Lewis, Ralph. National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.: 1976. (General reference book on museum practices and procedures with emphasis on historical and natural history museums.)

*Museum Data Bank Research Reports* Rochester, NY: Museum Data Bank Committee, 1974-1976. (These papers were prepared originally as background for in-depth discussions of the topics by the Museum Data Bank Committee. They contain some of the best information available on the complex subject of museum data banking.)

*Protecting Our Heritage: A Discourse on Fire Protection and Prevention in Historic Buildings and Landmarks,* second edition. NFPA Committee on Libraries, Museums and Historic Buildings. Boston: NFPA, 1970, 39 pp. (Includes a brief nontechnical description of various types of fire protection equipment that are applicable to historic sites.)

*Recommended Practice for the Protection of Museum Collections from Fire.* (No. 911) Boston: NFPA, 1974. (Museum fire experience. Construction, building equipment and facilities. Fire protection equipment. Improving protection in existing buildings. Precautions during alterations and renovations.)

*Standard for the Protection of Records* (No. 232). Boston: NFPA, 1970, 93 pp. (Design and construction of fire-resistive buildings, vaults, file rooms and safes. Management, classification and subsequent disposal of records. Record protection equipment techniques.)

*Synthetic Materials Used in the Conservation of Cultural Property,* Rome: International Center for Conservation, 1963, 67 pp. (Considers substances that are intended to remain in contact with museum objects over long periods of time, from one occasion for conservation to the next.)

*Temporary and Traveling Exhibitions,* Paris: UNESCO, 1963, 123 pp. (Temporary exhibitions in science and art museums, principles of packing; transportation and insurance.)

*Textile Conservation,* edited by Jenita E. Leene, Washington, D.C: IIC/Smithsonian, 1972, 275 pp., ill. (Cloth bound) (Chapters by

authorities from Europe and America, including basic information on characteristics of textiles and dyestuffs, principles of cleaning and practice of conservation and restoration of flat textiles, uniforms and dresses, lace, beadwork, featherwork and leather, aimed primarily at restorers of textiles, curators and scientists in museum laboratories.)

*The Museum in America: A Critical Study,* by Laurence Vail Coleman, Washington, D.C., republication of 1939 edition, 428 pp. (A commentary on museums as a whole — the institution in different patterns, the work it does, the people who give it life — all in the matrix of society.

## Periodicals

A Report on the Storage Conference. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (5): 17-18, 21-22, May/June 1977 (Summary of final report on the International Conference on Museum Storage, December 13-17, 1976, Washington, D.C., organized by UNESCO and the International Council of Museums)

Alderson, William T.: Grantsmanship: A Primer. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (6): 40-43, February 1973 (Concrete advice to prospective grant applicants)

Allen, Carl G. and Block, Huntington T.: Should Museums Form a Buyers' Pool for Insurance. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (6), 32-35, March 1974. (Pros and cons of an intermuseum fine arts insurance pool)

Berger, Gustav A. and Riley, Orrin H.: New Solutions for Modern Problems. *Museum News,* Vol 51 (5): 31-36, January 1973 (A new adhesive for the consolidation of works of art)

Block, Huntington T., Insurance: An Integral Part of Your Security Dollar. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 26-29, January 1972 (An insurance broker points out how to simplify insurance buying)

Buck, Richard: Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (1): 15-16, September 1973. (Definition of condition)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (3): 12-13, November 1973. (What motivates treatment)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (4): 15-16, December 1973. (Report on a laboratory examination)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (5): 20, 23-24, January/February 1974. (Scientific examination by infrared, ultraviolet and x-ray)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (6): 16, 18-19, March 1974. (Systems of analysis)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (7): 8-9, April 1974. (The energy crisis and conservation of museum collections)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (8): 10-11, May 1974 (Regional conservation centers)

Richard Buck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (9): 20, 22, June 1974. (Conservation in the next decade)

Chapman, Joseph M.: Fire. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 32-35, January 1972. (Information on fire and protecting against it)

Your Security Questions Answered. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 22-25, January 1972. (Answers to some of the most commonly asked questions on museum security)

Chenhall, Robert G.: Sharing the Wealth. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (8): 21-22, April 1973. (Report on research efforts of establishing a universal computer network)

Compton, Mildred S.: *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (2): 34-37, November/December 1976 (What accreditation can and cannot do)

Elsen, Altert.: Commentary. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (5): 7, 12, 14-15, May/June 1977 (California Rosale Royalties Law)

Faul, Roberta H.: Going Metric. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (6): 15-17, 72, July/August 1976. (United States conversion to the internally used system of measurement)

Fikioris, Margaret A.: A Model for Textile Storage. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (3): 34-41, November 1973 (Measurements and specifications of a modern facility at the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum)

Margaret A. Fikioris: Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (1): 13-18, September/October 1976. (Textile cleaning and storage)

Margaret A. Fikioris: Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (2): 8-9, November/December 1976. (Remounting framed textiles)

Gossin, Francis: A Security Chief Comments on Guards. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 30-31, January 1972. (Some aspects of maintaining the guard force at Munson-Williams Proctor Institute)

Heller, Don B.: Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (5): 25-29, May/June 1977. (Conserving metal objects)

Hill, John I.: A Consumer Guide to Security Sytems. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (6): 34-37, July/August 1977. (Unique security problems of a museum require unique solutions)

Hoachlander, Marjorie E.: Wanted: Films and Videotapes. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (4): 49-51, March/April 1976. (Availability of film and television content for learning and information)

Hughes, Olga: Storage on a Shoestring. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (3): 37-38, November 1972. (An inexpensive system for storage of paintings in a small museum)

Katsive, David: Museums Enter the Video Generation. *Museum News,* Vol. (5): 20-24, January 1973. (Uses of video equipment to improve museum operations, programs and exhibitions)

Keck, Caroline: Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (3): 9, November 1971 (Caring for your collection)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 5 (4): 13, December 1971. (Equipment needed for elementary care)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 10-11, January 1972. (Framing specifications)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (6): 9, February 1971. (Locating competent conservators)

Caroline Keck, On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (7): 13, March 1972. (Converting fluorescent lighting in exhibition cases)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (8): 13, April 1972. (Relative humidity controls)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (9): 9, May, 1972. (Prevention of vandalism)

Caroline Keck: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (9): 13, May 1972. (Emergency treatment of water damages)

Keck, Sheldon: A Little Training Can be a Dangerous Thing. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (4): 40-42, December 1973. (Parameters of responsibility for the nonspecialist)

Lins, P. Andrew: Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (3): 5-7, 8-9, January/February 1977. (Preventive measures for ceramics and glass)

Lynn, Robin: On the Road: A Brief Guide to Traveling Exhibition Sources. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (1): 64-66, 68, September/October 1975. (Detailed information on 11 organizations and suggestions for additional sources)

Majewski, Lawrence: Every Museum Library Should Have . . . *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (3): 27-30, November 1973. (An annotated bibliography for starting a technical reference library on conservation problems in a museum)

Majewski, Lawrence: Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (1): 8, September 1972. (Care of archaeological materials)

Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation, *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (1): 8, September 1972. (Care of archaeological materials)

Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (2): 13-14, October 1972. (Care of objects made of wood)

Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (3): 11-12, November 1972 (Conservation problems at an archaeological site which are similar to those of small museum)

Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (4): 11-12, December 1972 (Care of frescoes from archaeological finds in museums)

Lawrence Majewski: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (6): 8-10, February 1973. (Care of ethnographic material)

Manner, Dorothy A.: Professionalizing the Museum Worker. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 14-20, June 1972. (Problems of and strategies for museum workers in achieving full professional status)

McCowan, Richard J.: A Watchful Eye in the Public Interest. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (5): 29-30, May/June 1976. (Administrative and regulatory powers of the U.S. Customs Service as they relate to museums)

Montias, J. Michael: Are Museums Betraying the Public Trust? *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (9): 25-28, May 1973. (Using the Metropolitan Museum of Art as a case history, an economist discusses donations, acquisitions and disposals as part of the public domain)

Moore, Donald W., Jr.: A Watchful Eye in the Public Interest. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (5): 26, May/June 1976. (Administrative and regulatory powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as they relate to museums)

Moore, Waldo: A Watchful Eye in the Public Interest. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (5): 30-31, May/June 1976. (Administrative and regulatory powers of the U.S. Copyright Office as they relate to museums)

Otorewitz, Rubin: Commentary. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (5): 7-8, 10-11, May/June 1977. (California Resale Royalties Law)

Perkinson, Roy: Roy Perkinson: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 53 (3): 5-7, November 1974. (Lighting works of art)

Roy Perkinson: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (5): 7-8, January/February 1975. (Hinging prints and drawings)

Roy Perkinson: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 54 (6): 5-6, March 1975. (Acidity in paper)

Roy Perkinson: On Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 53 (8): 6-8, May 1975. (Unframing and examining works of art on paper)

Pfeffer, Irving and Uhr, Ernest B.: The Truth About Art Museum Insurance. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (6): 23-31, March 1974. (A study of art museum insurance for the Association of Art Museum Directors)

Pomerantz, Louis: Know What You See. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (4): 16-23, December 1971. (A painting conservator shares his knowledge with the museum visitor in an exhibition "Know What You See")

Professional Practices Committee of the Association of Art Museums Directives: Professional Practices in Art Museums. *Museum News.* Vol. 51 (2): 15-20, October 1972. (A report on the administration of art museums with potential reference to all types and sizes of museums)

*"Registrars' Report",* Vol. I, May 1977. (The role of the registrar as seen by museum directors as well as registrars themselves)

*"Registrars' Report",* Vol. I, No. 3, October 1977. (Includes information on shipment of works of art by air)

Rowlison, Eric B.: Rules for Handling Works of Art. *Museum News,* Vol. 53 (7): 10-13, April 1975. (Easy-to-follow guidelines helpful in working situations)

Sarasan, Lenore, Miller, Marilyn J., and members of the Department of Anthropology: "Cannibals, Catalogs and Computers: The AIM Computerization Project at Field Museum," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin.* Vol. 48, No. 8, Sept. 1977, pp. 10-13. (Narrative account of a very cost-effective program to computerize records of a large collection as it was moved and inventoried. Unexpected consistency and accuracy of very old records contributed greatly to project's success)

Schwalbe, Douglas: Are You An Amateur Administrator? *Museum News,* Vol. 51 (5): 26-27, January 1973. (Principles of and continuing education for better museum management)

Stoner, Joyce Hill: Conservation. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (6): 9-12, July/August 1977. (An Oral History archive)

Swinney, H.J.: *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (2): 15-17, November/December 1976. (Growth and development of the accreditation program)

Tusk, Carroll B.: The Invisible Danger of Visible Light. *Museum News,* Vol. (7): 22-23, April 1975. (Describes damage caused by daylight and incandescent light as well as ultraviolet and infrared)

Ullberg, Alan D. and Ullberg, Patricia: A Proposed Curatorial Code of Ethics. *Museum News,* Vol. 52 (8): 18-22, May 1974. (A code of ethics to provide guidelines for museum personnel in areas where conscience may be the only guide)

Vance, David: "Museum Computer Network: Progress Report", *The Museologist,* No. 135, Dec. 1975, pp. 3-10. (A history of the Museum Computer Network. *The Museologist* is a publication of the Northeast Museums Conference)

Vance, David and Heller, Jack: "Structure and Content of a Museum Data Bank", *Computers and the Humanities,* Vol. 6, No. 2, Nov. 1971. (First presentation of theories and concepts that grew into the present GRIPHOS system and the Museum Computer Network. Some details a little naive in light of hindsight)

VanDevender, R. Wayne: "Michigan Studies Computer Costs", *Association of Systematics Collections Newsletter.* Vol. iv., No. 6, Dec. 1976, pp. 72-73. (Brief, but one of very few serious discussions of cost projection)

Vaughan, Thomas: A Simple Matter of Standards. *Museum News,* Vol. 55 (3): 32-33, 45, January/February 1977. (A commentary on professional ethics)

Weldon, Stephen: Winterthur: Security at a Decorative Arts Institution. *Museum News,* Vol. 50 (5): 36-37, January 1972. (How a large institution selects, trains and maintains its security force)

This working bibliography for registrars was prepared by Elizabeth L. Burnham, Albina De Meio, Patricia Nauert, Katherine Paris, David Vance, and Anthony Wright.

# ADVISEMENT GROUPS

**Survey of Registrars and Materials Development**

*Group 1: May 1977-January 1978*

Thomas Beckman
Milwaukee Art Museum
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Barbara Chandler
Philadelphia Art Museum
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Albina DeMeio
Museum of the Philadelphia Civic Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Martha Morris
Museum of History and Technology
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

Ellen Myette
Renwick Gallery
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C

Patricia Nauert
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Los Angeles, California

Katherine Paris
Columbus Gallery of Art
Columbus, Ohio

Janice Stanland
Georgia Museum of Art
Athens, Georgia

Linda Thomas
Boston Museum of Fine Arts
Boston, Massachusetts

Anthony Wright
Denver Art Museum
Denver, Colorado

*Group 2: February 1978-June 1979*

Albina DeMeio
Museum of the Philadelphia Civic Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

H. Michael Eisler
J.B. Lippincott Company
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

John Haney
Instructional Development Center of
Queens College
City University of New York
New York, New York

Charlotte Johnson
Lowie Museum of Anthropology
Lafayette, California

Philip Leslie
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

Mary Elizabeth Osher
Museum Consultant
Phoenix, Arizona

Susan Reichman
Museum Leadership Program
Bank Street College of Education
New York, New York

Eric Rowlison
National Gallery of Victoria
Melbourne, Australia

Virginia White
Grants, Plenum Press
New York and London

Anthony Wright
Denver Art Museum
Denver, Colorado

*Honorary Advisers*

Dorothy Dudley (deceased 1979)
Biddeford, Maine

Irma Bezold Wilkinson
Sharon, Connecticut

Helena Weiss
Washington, D.C.

**Survey of Museum Directors: January 1977 - June 1979**

Ronald Barber
Museum of the Philadelphia Civic Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Robert Bishop
Museum of American Folk Art
New York, New York

Richard S. Carroll
John and Mable Ringling Art Museum
Sarasota, Florida

Robert H. Frankel
Phoenix Art Museum
Phoenix, Arizona

Richard Grove
Henry Art Gallery
Seattle, Washington

Patrick Houlihan
The Heard Museum
Phoenix, Arizona

Peter R. Mooz
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts
Richmond, Virginia

# REFERENCE NOTES


1. S. Dillon Ripley: "The View From The Castle," *Smithsonian*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Associates, 1978) p. 8.
2. Hilton Kramer: "When the Man in Charge is Not the Man Who Knows," *The New York Times*, July 3, 1977, Section 2, p. 1.
3. Grace Glueck: "How Fares the Met Museum In The Post-Hoving Era?," *The New York Times*, April 8, 1979, Section 2, p. 1.
4. Statement on Preparation for Professional Museum Careers," *Museum News*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1978), p. 22.
5. John R. Fleming: *America's Museums: The Belmont Report*, edited by Michael W. Robbins (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1969). A report to the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities by a special committee of the American Association of Museums chaired by E. Leland Webber. (LCN 74-80109)
6. *International Symposium on Museums in the Contemporary World* (Paris UNESCO House, November 1969). Translated from the French, May 1970.
7. A. Bret Waller: "Museum Training Programs: Are They Needed? Are They Working?" Unpublished report for a Museum Training Conference held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, on November 20, 1971. Distributed by the museum to those in attendance and also recorded/transcribed by the author.
8. *Museum Studies: A Curriculum Guide for Universities and Museums*, edited by Edward P. Alexander (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1973). A report by the Museum Studies Curriculum Committee of the American Association of Museums.
9. "Minutes of the Conference on Museum Training Programs, December, 1972," edited by Charles Sawyer. (Reproduced and distributed under the auspices of the Office of Museum Programs, The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1973). The theme was "Museum/University Relations."
10. G. Ellis Burcaw: *Museum Training Courses in the United States and Canada* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1968).
11. *Ibid.*, Preface.
12. Although a legislative fact as early as 1965, the National Museum Act was not funded until 1971. Beginning in July, 1972, The Smithsonian Institution, through its Office of Museum Programs, began awarding grants to institutions offering qualified approaches to the training and development of museum personnel, as well as organizing programs of its own for a limited number of enrollees.

13. Marjorie E. Hoachlander: "Museum Technology: An Emerging Field of Occupational Education," unpublished doctoral study report, ED 202 Junior College Curriculum and "Viewpoints Toward Renewal: Career Education in Museums," videotape report produced for Instructional Media Services (College Park: The University of Maryland, January, 1972).
14. G. Ellis Burcaw: "Museum Training: The Responsibility of the College and University Museums" and "Graduate Training in Museology," *Museum News,* Vol. 47, No. 8 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1969), pp. 15 and 17, respectively. The issue was devoted to the topic, "The Museum and the University." It has been announced by the Editor of *Museum News* that this topic will be addressed again in the January/February 1980 issue.
15. Richard Grove: "Campus Museums: The Troves of Academe." Paper presented in the College and University section, 1969 annual meeting of the American Association of Museums, San Francisco, May 26, 1969, p. 5.
16. As given in report of November 1971 Conference on Museum Training at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.
17. This aspect was discussed further, but to no avail, during an *ad hoc* meeting held immediately after the adjournment of the 1971 conference noted in reference note 16. Later, the subject was addressed in *Museums: Their New Audience,* a report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development by a special committee of the American Association of Museums, chaired by James Elliott and John R. Kinard, April 1972. It urged that "museums should establish training programs to open careers in museums at all levels of education" (Recommendation No. 6, p. 14).
18. Richard Grove: *Museums and Media: A Status Report.* Series One Paper through ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Media and Technology at the Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1971. Based on a paper prepared for the President's Commission on Instructional Technology, edited by Sidney Tickton, 1968.

    Philip C. Ritterbush: *Museums and Media: A Basic Reference Shelf.* Also to be found within Series One Paper available from ERIC, as cited above.

    Lola Erickson Rogers: *Museums and Related Institutions: A Basic Program Survey* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969, Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.210.10061).
19. *Museums USA: A Survey Report* (Washington, D.C.: The National Endowment for the Arts, 1975). This report was prepared for the Endowment by the National Research Center of the Arts, Inc., which under contract, conducted the research for this project. The Endowment itself prepared and published *Museums USA: Highlights,* a pamphlet summarizing some of the key findings of this study, and *Museums, USA,* a 200-page

publication presenting detailed findings in narrative and graphic format. All three publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
21. *Ibid.*, see Personnel Section, Job Categories in any of the three publications.
22. An interesting and thorough account of how the Williamsburg Seminar developed, written by Edward Alexander, appears in the November/December 1978 issue of *Museum News*, p. 4.
23. *National Museum Act: Report on Grants 1972-1978.* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), pp. 10, 22, 34, 44, 52, 62, and 68.
24. Readers are advised to communicate with each of these museums for informational brochures on available programs and text materials: Old Sturbridge Village, Sturbridge, Mass. 01566, (617) 347-3362; Cooperstown Indian Museum, Box 123, Cooperstown, N.Y. 13326, (607) 547-9531.
25. For further information, write or call Museums Collaborative, Inc., 15 Gramercy Park South, New York, N.Y. 10003, (212) 674-0030; Western Association of Art Museums, Mills College, P.O. Box 9989, Oakland, Calif. 94613, (415) 568-2773.
26. It appears that AASLH is becoming strongly identified as the primary source for instructional materials on behalf of museum training. This association will send complete brochures of available titles upon request. Write The American Association of State and Local History, 1400 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tennessee 37203, or call (615) 242-5583.
27. A second Belmont meeting reviewed the earlier report and, at the 1976 annual conference of the AAM, made more specific recommendations which are now being carried out by a second Curriculum Committee. The members are: Edward P. Alexander, former Director of Museum Studies, University of Delaware; Dolo Brooking, Director of Museum Education, Helen Foresman Spencer Museum of Art, University of Kansas; Jonathan Brown, Director, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University; Muriel B. Cristison, Director, Krannert Art Museum; Carol Clark, Curator of Paintings, Aom Carter Museum of Western Art; John P. Daniels, Head of Education and State Service, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art; Jane R. Glaser, Program Manager, Office of Museum Programs, Smithsonian Institution; Ben Hazard, Curator of Special Exhibitions and Special Education, Oakland Museum; Sue Hoth, Coordinator, Center for Museum Education, George Washington University; Darwin P. Kelsey, Director of Museum Administration, Old Sturbridge Village; Mary Elizabeth King, Keeper of Collections, The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania; Raul A. Lopez, Director, Riverside Municipal Museum; James Mahoney, Chief, Exhibits Central, Smithsonian Institution; Frank J. McKelvey, Jr., Curator of Mechanical

Arts, Hagley Museum; Minor Wine Thomas, Jr., Director, New York State Historical Association; Bret Waller, Director, University of Michigan Museum of Art, and Nancy Cloud, Staff. The committee's statement on preparation for professional museum careers, as it pertains to those entering courses on museum training, may be found in *Museum News,* November/December, 1978, p. 21. The committee has not, as yet, dealt with the continuing education of professionals currently working in museums.

28. The division of Museum Studies, Center for Advanced Study in Education (CASE), Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York, originated the concept for this project and invited the collaboration of Cooper-Hewitt, The Smithsonian's National Museum of Design, because of its acknowledged interest in education as well as its creative use of film and videotape within exhibitions. These institutions submitted a joint proposal to funding sources, with CASE acting as fiscal agent for grants as awarded. To afford optimum empirical approach to the data gathered, the American Association of Museums endorsed the project, collaborated in the pilot study, but, otherwise, was not officially involved in project activities. Advisers were invited on the basis of individual level of interest and expertise in relation to the project. The Academy for Educational Development joined in the publication of this report after the project was completed, because of its interest in the advancement of professionalism and the improvement of university/museum relations in education.
29. Susan Stitt: *The Museum Labor Market: A Survey of American Historical Agency Placement Opportunities* (Sturbridge: Old Sturbridge Village, 1976).
30. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
31. James M. Kittleman: "Museum Mismanagement," reprint from *Museum News* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, March/April, 1976).
32. Patricia Nauert: "From the Editors: The Role of the Registrar," *Registrars' Report,* Vol. 1. (Los Angeles: Registrars' Report, Inc., subscription from profession, 1977). This commentary with corresponding interviews was developed concurrently with the *Profile of a Museum Registrar* study, based upon an earlier report authored by Nauert on a developmental conference for registrars held at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, September 1974. Nauert was active as an adviser during the proposal-writing stages of this research project, contributing further toward the annotated bibliography. Temporarily, *Registrars' Report* has discontinued publication, but, as of this writing, information has been received that it will resume activities under new sponsorship. Inquiry may be addressed to *Registrars' Report,* P.O. Box 112, Bicentennial Station, Los Angeles, California 90048.

33. Rudolph Arnheim: *Visual Thinking* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 60-62.
34. Telephone conference with Anthony Wright, member of advisement group, August 1978.
35. "Administrators' Salaries in Academic 1978-79," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Vol. 18, No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.), p. 6.
36. *The Official Museum Directory* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums and Skokie: National Register Publishing Company, Inc., 1976) (LCN 79-144808).
37. Each interview was transferred to an audiocassette recorder connected (with permission of the director) by a pickup coil attached to the telephone receiver. The entire series of interviews was later transcribed through a dictaphone system.
38. K. Patricia Cross: *Accent on Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 213. Cross has coined the word to indicate the generic applications of the technique, noting that the skills videotaped are job specific, that is, they are *acts* carried out by the worker. Had there been a higher acceptance level of video (among respondents) evident in the data, the pilot would have been further refined into identifiable acts so as to apply the fundamental learning principles used ordinarily with microteaching: *identifying objectives, modeling, feedback,* and *practice.* Interested readers are also advised to turn to the work of D.W. Allen and K. Ryan: *Microteaching* (Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley, 1969).
39. Equipment used: Sony 1600 color camera, Sony VO-3800 recorder with color pack, and a Senheiser 815 shotgun microphone. For postproduction, a Sony VO-2860 recorder/editor was used.
40. The production company under contract to the project was TVG Productions, 1697 Broadway, New York City, N.Y. 10019. Co-director was Stefan Moore; camera work was done by Claude Beller.
41. Dorothy H. Dudley and Irma Bezold Wilkinson: *Museum Registration Methods* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums with the Smithsonian Institution, 1979). This is the third edition of what is regarded by the profession as the standard text for registrars. Its original version, published jointly in 1958, was revised in 1968, also.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12. *Please note:* these pages are as in second edition, 1968.
43. *Ibid.*, remarks by Richard F. Buck in third edition (actual pages not available for notation since third edition has not yet been distributed.)
44. Michael Bell: "Notes Toward a Condition Report," paper presented at Registrars' session, "Condition Reports: Who, What, Where, When, and Why," May 31, 1977, at annual meeting of the AAM, Seattle, Washington. Bell has compiled a manuscript on this subject for which a publisher/sponsor is being sought.

This need, as well as continued discussion on the topic, was presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the AAM, Kansas City, Missouri. It is suggested that interested readers get in touch with Bell at The Oakland Museum, 1000 Oak Street, Oakland, California 94607.

45. In 1959, Marjorie Hoachlander, then Supervisor of Studio Production for an experimental television project funded by the Ford Foundation, explored the use of black and white television (live, by cable) for examining and describing the museum object. The work was done in collaboration with Bruce Etchison, Director, Washington County Museum of Fine Arts, Hagerstown, Maryland. Etchison is now a free-lance conservator. In 1972, Hoachlander used black and white ½" videotape for similar work at the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, Washington, D.C., in collaboration with John Kinard, Director, and the museum's staff. Concurrent with plans for conducting a formal comparison of color video with other formats as a research component of *Profile of a Museum Registrar,* two informal explorations of the use of color video for condition reporting were made by Hilary Bassett, Registrar, and Vanessa Wicker, Assistant Registrar, Indianapolis Museum of Art and Rita Feigenbaum, Registrar, The State of the Art Exhibition, Albany, New York. A presentation of the registrars' work was made at the annual meeting of the Northeast Regional Registrars Committee, Philadelphia Museum of Art, on December 2, 1977. Hoachlander is interested in collecting additional data on similar efforts. Please send information to Dr. Marjorie E. Hoachlander, Museum Programs, The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1414 Twenty-second Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. (Advise as to format and availability for screening.)
46. Advisers present were Albina DeMeio, Philip Leslie, and Anthony Wright (see List of Advisement Groups on p. ). Present also were Lisa Taylor, Director, and Elizabeth N. Burnham, Registrar, of Cooper-Hewitt.
47. Robert Wells, Minister of Culture and Recreation, spoke to members of the museum profession from the United States and Canada at the Northeast Regional Meeting of the AAM, hosted by the Canadian Museums Association in Toronto, November 1977.
48. These remarks were taken from the notes of the project director who attended the Toronto meeting for background information on *Profile of a Museum Registrar.* As far as it is known, there is no professional audiotape of Perrot's inspiring address, nor, unfortunately, is there a transcript of it available.
49. E.F. Schumacher: *Small is Beautiful: Economics As If People Mattered* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 84-85.
50. *Relating Work and Education,* edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco and London: Jossey-Bass Publishers, for the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1977), Preface, ix.

51. Adele M. Scheele: "Successful Careering," *Relating Work and Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), pp. 195-203.
52. Contrary to the popular conception of the term, life-long learning is described by Stanley Nollen in the above publication as "recurrent learning which is formally organized and undertaken in alternation with work after the initial schooling period. It is further restricted (in Nollen's study) to adults in the labor force and to cases in which there is employer support and involvement.", *Ibid.*, p. 66.
53. "Campus Programs to Train Museum Workers Proliferate," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc., 1977), May 16, p. 1. This article remarks on the lack of uniform standards among programs designed to train people to work in museums — "a cause of considerable concern and debate among museum directors and educators." Coupled with this is another article, "University Museums Feel Financial Squeeze," which reports on the lack of campus support for acquisitions and educational programs making it necessary for many directors to devote increasing time to raising funds from private sources.
54. "Statement on Preparation for Professional Museum Careers," *Museum News,* Vol. 57, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1978), p. 22. It is suggested that attention also be turned to "The Director: Scholar and Businessman, Educator and Lobbyist," a research report by Alan Shestack, Chairman of a committee appointed by the American Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) to look into the question of directorial training. Intended as an internal study for the use of AAMD members, the project was funded by the William H. Donner Foundation in 1976. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
55. Minaruth Galey: "Certification Programs of Professional Associations," *Audiovisual Instruction,* Vol. 24, No. 5 (Washington, D.C.: The Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1979), p. 34.

# Appendix A

## *Facsimile of Survey Booklet*
## *Profile of a Registrar*

**Directions:** Please place check marks or supply information in the spaces provided. Give only ONE response unless otherwise requested.

### About You, The Respondent

1. Citizenship
   - U.S. ..... ☐ 4
   - Canada ..... ☐
   - Other _____ ☐
     *(Please specify)*

2. Sex Male..... ☐ Female..... ☐ 5

3. Age Range
   - 21-29 ..... ☐ 6
   - 30-39 ..... ☐
   - 40-49 ..... ☐
   - 50-59 ..... ☐
   - 60 and over ..... ☐

4. Language Fluency *(Please check all that apply)*

| | Speak | Read | Write | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | 7 |
| French..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | 8 |
| Spanish ..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | 9 |
| German ..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | 10 |
| Other _____ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | 11 |

*(Please specify)*

5. Academic levels achieved

| | Year Completed | Major Area of Study | |
|---|---|---|---|
| High School ..... | _____ | _____ | 12-14 |
| Associate Degree ..... | _____ | _____ | |
| *(2-year, Community College)* | | | |
| B.A. or B.S. ..... | _____ | _____ | |
| M.A. or M.S..... | _____ | _____ | |
| Ph.D. or Ed.D. ..... | _____ | _____ | |
| Other _____ | | _____ | |

*(Please specify)*

6. Certificate or Non-Degree Study

| Subject | Source *(Institution or Association)* | Year | |
|---|---|---|---|
| _____ | _____ | ____ | 15 |
| _____ | _____ | ____ | |

7. In your opinion, how closely does your educational background relate to your museum's collection?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very closely | ☐ | Barely close | ☐ 16 |
| Reasonably close | ☐ | Not at all | ☐ |

8. How have you received your training in museum work?
*(Check as many as apply)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Graduate course(s) in museology | ☐ 17 |
| Undergraduate course(s) in museology | ☐ 18 |
| Volunteer museum work | ☐ 19 |
| Paid museum work | ☐ 20 |
| Internship | ☐ 21 |
| Other *(Specify)*_____ | ☐ 22 |

9. In any of your previous educational experiences, have you learned by the use of any of the following forms of media?
*(Please check all that apply)*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Film | ☐ 23 | Slide/Tape | ☐ 26 |
| Videotape | ☐ 24 | Slides | ☐ 27 |
| Audiocassette | ☐ 25 | None of the above | ☐ 28 |

10. What do you regard as the most important part(s) of your training?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. What do you regard as the most critical lack(s) in your training?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Types of previous employment *(Please check all that apply)*

| | | No. of Yrs. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Secretary | ☐ | _____ | 29-31 |
| Librarian | ☐ | _____ | 32-34 |
| Teacher | ☐ | _____ | 35-37 |
| Computer keypuncher | ☐ | _____ | 38-40 |
| Computer programmer | ☐ | _____ | 41-43 |
| Insurance agent | ☐ | _____ | 44-46 |
| Curator | ☐ | _____ | 47-49 |
| Conservator | ☐ | _____ | 50-52 |
| Other _____ *(Please specify)* | ☐ | _____ | 53-55 |

13. What job did you hold before your present one? *(Please describe, giving title and function)*

_____

_____

_____

14. Total number of years employed as a Registrar *(Or in performing registrarial functions in the museum field)*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-5 | ☐ | 16-20 | ☐ | 31 years or more | ☐ 56 |
| 6-10 | ☐ | 21-25 | ☐ | | |
| 11-15 | ☐ | 26-30 | ☐ | | |

15. Professional title *(Please check the one that applies to your present working situation)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Registrar | ☐ 57 |
| Associate Registrar | ☐ |
| Assistant Registrar | ☐ |
| Have a title OTHER than Registrar, but perform registrarial functions *(Specify)* _____ | ☐ |
| Designated as Registrar, but have an additional staff title *(Specify)* _____ | ☐ |

16. To whom do you report?

Director ..... ☐ Conservator ..... ☐ 58
Curator ..... ☐ A combination of the above ..... ☐
Other *(Specify)*_____ ☐

17. Extent of present employment

| a. | | b. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time ..... ☐ | 59 | Salaried staff member ..... ☐ | 60 |
| Part-time ..... ☐ | | Consultant on contract ..... ☐ | |
| | | Volunteer ..... ☐ | |

18. Range of your present salary

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| $7,999 or less ..... ☐ | 61 | $18,000-22,999 ..... ☐ | |
| $8,000- 12,999..... ☐ | | $23,000-27,999 ..... ☐ | |
| $13,000-17,999 ..... ☐ | | $28,000 or more ..... ☐ | |

19. How many others work with you on registrarial functions? *(If none, put zero in each space)*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time, paid? _____ | 62 | Full-time, volunteer? _____ | 64 |
| Part-time, paid? _____ | 63 | Part-time, volunteer? _____ | 65 |

## About The Museum Where You Are Employed

20. Type of museum

Art ..... ☐ Natural History.... ☐ Anthropology ... ☐ 4
Science..... ☐ Historical ..... ☐ General ..... ☐
A combination of the above *(Specify)* _____ ☐
Other *(Specify)*_____ ☐

Municipal ..... ☐ 5 State ..... ☐ 6
Federal ..... ☐ University..... ☐
Other *(Specify)*_____ ☐

Public ..... ☐ 7 Private ..... ☐
A combination of the above ..... ☐

21. Regional location

New England (CT,ME,MA,NH,RI,VT) ..... ☐ 8
Northeast (DE,DC,MD,NJ,NY,PA) ..... ☐
Midwest (IL,IN,IA,MI,MN,MO,OH,WI) ..... ☐
Mountain Plains (CO,KS,MT,NE,NM,ND,OK,SD,TX,WY) ... ☐
Western (AZ,CA,HI,ID,OR,NV,UT,WA,Alaska) ..... ☐
Southeast (AL,AR,FL,GA,KY,LA,MS,NC,SC,TN,VA,WV) ... ☐

22. Physical size *(approximate)*_____ sq. ft. 9

23. How long in operation_____ years. 10

24. Size of collection

Number of objects or specimens_____
We have no permanent collection..... ☐ 11

25. Are there any particular characteristics of your museum that make registrarial functions especially important to its operations? If so, describe below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

26. Exhibition activity within your museum *(Please check all that apply)*

Collection on permanent exhibition ..... ☐ 12
Changing exhibitions of permanent collection ..... ☐ 13
Temporary incoming loans or exhibitions..... ☐ 14
Temporary outgoing loans or exhibitions ..... ☐ 15
Other (*Please describe)*_____ ☐ 16

_____

_____

27. Annual operating budget level of your museum

Less than $50,000 ..... ☐
$50,000-$249,999 ..... ☐
$250,000-$499,999 ..... ☐
$500,000-$999,999 ..... ☐ 17
$1,000,000 or over ..... ☐

28. Annual operating budget level of Registrar's department
*(Please supply)* $_____ 18

29. How often does your museum hold on-the-job training sessions for you?

Annually ..... ☐ Monthly ..... ☐ Weekly ... ☐ 19
Semi-annually.... ☐ Four times a year ... ☐ Never .... ☐

30. Are you satisfied with the amount of on-the-job training you presently receive? YES ☐ NO ☐ 20

31. Is your museum affiliated with an academic institution that offers a program for your professional development? YES ☐ NO ☐ 21

If yes, which one? _____
Location _____

32. If you replied yes to #31, which of the following is(are) offered? *(Please check all that apply)*

| | Off-Campus | On-Campus |
|---|---|---|
| Degree program ..... | ☐ 22 | ☐ 26 |
| Seminars or Workshops ..... | ☐ 23 | ☐ 27 |
| Consultation with faculty ..... | ☐ 24 | ☐ 28 |
| Other *(Please specify)*_____ | ☐ 25 | ☐ 29 |

_____

Comment, if you wish, on any of the above programs.

_____
_____

33. **REGISTRARIAL FUNCTIONS** are diversified in nature. They are performed in varying patterns throughout a calendar year, and they vary from museum to museum. Please indicate which of the following you or your staff perform at your museum, and to what extent.

**Permanent Collections**

Cataloging collection material .....
Controlling storage inventory (survey of condition, record-keeping on location of objects or specimens) .....
Inspecting permanent installations .....
Processing requests for photographic services .....
Answering requests for information on collection (i.e., provenance, collection size, documentation) .....
Serving as liaison for visiting scholars viewing collection materials .....
Supplying measurements of objects in advance of exhibition design .....
Accessioning and assigning to number systems .....
Processing outgoing loans from the collection .....
Planning for storage .....
Supervising packing and unpacking .....
Making arrangements for shipping .....

**Temporary Exhibitions**

Preparing loan agreements .....
Assigning to number systems .....
Supervising packing and unpacking .....
Making arrangements for shipping .....
Inspecting temporary installations .....
Measuring items in advance for exhibition design .....
Arranging for insurance coverage .....
Processing insurance claims .....
Condition reporting .....

**General**

Typing .....
Filing .....
Writing reports to director .....
Reporting activities for staff information (i.e., meetings, bulletins) .....
Preparing or redesigning transaction forms .....
Traveling to coordinate registrarial activities .....
Participating in conferences, workshops .....
Corresponding with donors, lenders, vendors .....
Maintaining or updating permanent records .....
Conducting research on collection .....
Training staff in care and handling .....
Couriering .....

**OTHER(s)** *(to pertain to all categories above; write in)*

_____

_____

_____

**Make sure there is one check mark per function.**

| Never | Occasionally | Periodically | Often | Always | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 10 |
| | | | | | 11 |
| | | | | | 12 |
| | | | | | 13 |
| | | | | | 14 |
| | | | | | 15 |
| | | | | | 16 |
| | | | | | 17 |
| | | | | | 18 |
| | | | | | 19 |
| | | | | | 20 |
| | | | | | 21 |
| | | | | | 22 |
| | | | | | 23 |
| | | | | | 24 |
| | | | | | 25 |
| | | | | | 26 |
| | | | | | 27 |
| | | | | | 28 |
| | | | | | 29 |
| | | | | | 30 |
| | | | | | 31 |
| | | | | | 32 |
| | | | | | 33 |
| | | | | | 34 |
| | | | | | 35 |
| | | | | | 36 |
| | | | | | 37 |
| | | | | | 38 |
| | | | | | 39 |
| | | | | | 40 |
| | | | | | 41 |
| | | | | | 42 |
| | | | | | 43 |
| | | | | | 44 |
| | | | | | 45 |

34. DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIALS & METHODS FOR STUDY. Below is a suggested list of topics for study. Please rate each in terms of its importance to your professional training. **Use the following values: Most Important = 1; Very Important = 2; Important = 3; Less Important = 4; Least Important = 5.**

| | Rating Value | |
|---|---|---|
| Shipping and Packing | _____ | 30 |
| Storage: Design and Methods | _____ | 31 |
| Cataloging by Computer | _____ | 32 |
| Condition Reporting | _____ | 33 |
| Insurance | _____ | 34 |
| Importing and Exporting | _____ | 35 |
| Environmental Control | _____ | 36 |
| Measuring and Marking | _____ | 37 |
| Museum Law | _____ | 38 |
| Grantsmanship | _____ | 39 |
| Research Methods | _____ | 40 |
| General Business Management | _____ | 41 |
| Film and Videotape Production | _____ | 42 |
| Others *(Please specify)* | _____ | 43 |
| _____ | | 44 |

35. Consider next the forms of media shown here. **Regardless of how you have rated each topic above,** please select the form(s) of media that you would prefer to use for learning more about each topic.

*L-Lecture D-Demonstration T-Textbook P-Pamphlet A-Audio cassette S/T-Slide/Tape S-Slides F-Film V-Videotape

| TOPIC | Forms of Media * L | D | T | P | A | S/T | S | F | V | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shipping and Packing | | | | | | | | | | 45 |
| Storage: Design and Methods | | | | | | | | | | 46 |
| Cataloging by Computer | | | | | | | | | | 47 |
| Condition Reporting | | | | | | | | | | 48 |
| Insurance | | | | | | | | | | 49 |
| Importing and Exporting | | | | | | | | | | 50 |
| Environmental Control | | | | | | | | | | 51 |
| Measuring and Marking | | | | | | | | | | 52 |
| Museum Law | | | | | | | | | | 53 |
| Grantsmanship | | | | | | | | | | 54 |
| Research Methods | | | | | | | | | | 55 |
| General Business Management | | | | | | | | | | 56 |
| Film and Videotape Production | | | | | | | | | | 57 |
| Others *(Please specify)* _____ | | | | | | | | | | 58 |
| _____ | | | | | | | | | | 59 |
| _____ | | | | | | | | | | 60 |

36. How would you prefer to learn more about registration methods and other aspects of museum practice? (Please check all that apply.)

On the job ☐ 61
In a seminar/workshop held during an AAM conference ☐ 62
In a seminar/workshop held in a museum ☐ 63
In an academic degree program held at a college or university ☐ 64
Independent study, using reference materials ☐ 65
Telephone conferences with colleagues ☐ 66
Regular conferences with my director ☐ 67
Other *(Please describe)* _____ ☐ 68

_____

37. In a museum training program, would you prefer to be in a group that represents

registrars only? ☐ 69
other staff members as well as registrars? ☐

38. Should the faculty of a training program include

registrars only? ☐ 70
registrars and other museum professionals? ☐
professors from academic institutions? ☐
members from related business firms? ☐
a combination of these? ☐
Other _____ ☐

39. Should coursework in your area of Museum Studies be

directed toward the practical? ☐ 71
directed toward the history and philosophy of museums? ☐ 72
directed toward management? ☐ 73
directed toward basic registrarial functions? ☐ 74
directed toward a combination of the above? ☐ 75
Other *(Please specify)* _____ ☐ 76

40. Some think that the title of Registrar may not fully define the job and that a new title should be proposed. Please consider the following suggestions and check the ONE that you feel would be more suitable.

Assistant Director, Records and Collections ☐
Administrator of Collections and Temporary Loans ☐
Recordations Manager ☐ 30
_____ ☐
Curator for Registration ☐
Other *(Please specify)* _____ ☐
OR Prefer the title of Registrar to any of these suggested titles ☐

# Computerized Profile of a Museum Registrar

*Table 1.*

**Cross Tabulation of Age by Sex of Museum Registrars**

| | Sex | | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | |
| **Age** | % | % | % |
| 21 - 29 | 14.1 | 85.9 | 39 |
| 30 - 39 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 31 |
| 40 - 49 | 20.6 | 79.4 | 13 |
| 50 - 59 | 26.7 | 73.3 | 12 |
| 60 and over | 16.7 | 83.3 | 4.6 |
| Not reported | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.4 |
| Total | | | 100.0 |

Significance = 0.1688

*Table 2.*

**Forms of Media in Previous Educational Experience**

| | Film | Video | Audio Cassettes | Slide/ Tape | Slides | None of These |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 47.7 | 21.5 | 17.6 | 40.6 | 60.2 | 25.8 |
| No | 52.3 | 78.5 | 82.4 | 59.4 | 39.8 | 74.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

n = 256

*Table 3.*

**How Registrars Received Formal Training in Museum Work**

| | % Yes | % No | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Graduate courses in Museology | 19 | 81 | 100 |
| Undergraduate courses in Museology | 17 | 83 | 100 |
| Volunteer museum work | 35 | 65 | 100 |
| Paid museum work | 77 | 23 | 100 |
| Internship | 16 | 84 | 100 |

*Table 4.*

**Previous Employment by Type**

| Positions Held | % Employed | Mean Number of Years Employed |
|---|---|---|
| Secretary | 35 | 4.5 |
| Librarian | 15 | 3.3 |
| Teacher | 22 | 3.8 |
| Computer keypuncher | 4 | 1.9 |
| Computer programmer | 2 | 1.6 |
| Insurance agent | 2 | 3.0 |
| Curator | 12 | 3.8 |
| Conservator | 4 | 2.4 |
| Other | 4 | 5.3 |

Among other positions held were archaeologist, lab technician, anthropological research, rare book cataloguer, immigration officer, military pilot, receptionist, park historian, corrosion control specialist, and tour guide.

*Table 5.*

**Selected Topics For Study in Order of Preference by Mode**

| Topics | Mode* | Modal Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Condition Reporting | 1.00 | 40.4 |
| Storage: Design and Methods | 1.00 | 39.6 |
| Insurance | 1.00 | 38.1 |
| Shipping and Packing | 1.00 | 33.2 |
| Environmental Control | 2.00 | 31.4 |
| Measuring and Marking | 2.00 | 33.3 |
| Research Methods | 3.00 | 32.2 |
| General Business Management | 3.00 | 29.7 |
| Museum Law | 3.00 | 31.4 |
| Grantsmanship | 4.00 | 25.4 |
| Importing and Exporting | 5.00 | 32.6 |
| Cataloguing by Computer | 5.00 | 30.5 |
| Film and Video Tape Production | 5.00 | 61.1 |

*Based on 256
1 = Most Important
2 = Very Important
3 = Important
4 = Less Important
5 = Least Important

*Table 6.*

**Selected Topics for Study In Order of Preference by Percentage**

| Topic | Most Impt | Very Impt | Impt | Less Impt | Least Impt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condition Reporting | 41.2 | 33.6 | 18.1 | 5.0 | 2.1 |
| Storage: Design and Methods | 38.5 | 35.1 | 15.5 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Insurance | 37.7 | 26.4 | 19.7 | 8.8 | 7.5 |
| Shipping and Packing | 33.1 | 29.7 | 22.5 | 9.3 | 5.5 |
| Environmental Control | 28.9 | 31.0 | 25.5 | 9.2 | 5.4 |
| Measuring and Marking | 23.9 | 31.9 | 27.7 | 10.1 | 6.3 |
| Research Methods | 22.5 | 23.3 | 32.9 | 13.3 | 7.9 |
| General Business Management | 20.0 | 25.8 | 28.7 | 12.1 | 13.3 |
| Museum Law | 19.4 | 24.5 | 31.6 | 17.7 | 6.8 |
| Cataloging by Computer | 12.5 | 22.9 | 21.7 | 13.7 | 29.2 |
| Importing and Exporting | 11.9 | 15.3 | 22.0 | 19.1 | 31.8 |
| Grantsmanship | 9.3 | 15.2 | 25.7 | 24.1 | 25.7 |
| Film and Video Tape Prodtn. | 1.7 | 5.5 | 9.7 | 23.5 | 59.7 |

*Table 7.*

**Preference for Forms of Media by Study Topic and Frequency of Mention**

| Topic | Lecture | Demon-stration | Text-book | Pamphlet | Audio Cassette | Slide Tape | Slides | Film | Video-Tape |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Condition Reporting | 98 | 99 | 80 | 66 | 5 | 40 | 24 | 45 | 30 |
| Storage: Design and Methods | 74 | 83 | 81 | 53 | 3 | 55 | 39 | 53 | 34 |
| Insurance | 116 | 24 | 111 | 90 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 7 |
| Shipping and Packing | 82 | 177 | 46 | 45 | 2 | 35 | 25 | 50 | 37 |
| Environmental Control | 97 | 48 | 91 | 63 | 8 | 36 | 19 | 51 | 25 |
| Measuring and Marking | 59 | 131 | 64 | 61 | 8 | 41 | 22 | 41 | 29 |
| Research Methods | 114 | 37 | 127 | 57 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 11 |
| General Business Management | 128 | 31 | 147 | 50 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 14 |
| Museum Law | 132 | 19 | 144 | 65 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 10 |
| Cataloging By Computer | 93 | 103 | 98 | 40 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 21 | 19 |
| Importing and Exporting | 97 | 21 | 79 | 103 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 7 |
| Grantsmanship | 110 | 22 | 89 | 100 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 9 |
| Film and Video Tape Production | 70 | 115 | 49 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 17 | 63 | 57 |
| Total | 1270 | 910 | 1206 | 817 | 79 | 291 | 187 | 386 | 289 |

*Table 8.*

**Preference for Types of Training Program by Percentage**

| Type of Program | % Yes | % No | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Seminars/Museum | 83.1 | 16.9 | 100 |
| On the job | 73.3 | 26.7 | 100 |
| Seminars/AAM | 56.5 | 43.5 | 100 |
| Independent study | 46.3 | 53.7 | 100 |
| Academic degree program | 36.1 | 63.9 | 100 |
| Telephone conferences | 29.8 | 70.2 | 100 |
| Regular conference with director | 20.8 | 79.2 | 100 |
| Other* | 3.5 | 96.5 | 100 |

*Mentioned: internship at another museum with established department (2); discussion session with colleagues (2); an academic degree program for people coming into the field; seminars for those already in the museums; regular conference with business manager; regional conference; extended internships; regional workshops; academic programs would possibly be good for a neophyte; anything that gives information; seminar or workshop *not* at AAM conference.

*Table 9.*

**Preference for Coursework in Training Programs by Percentages**

| Type of Coursework | % Yes | % No | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Combination of all | 72.8 | 28.0 | 100 |
| Practical | 35.4 | 64.6 | 100 |
| Basic registrarial functions | 28.3 | 71.7 | 100 |
| Management | 15.7 | 84.3 | 100 |
| History/Philosophy | 3.5 | 98.5 | 100 |
| Other* | 2.8 | 96.1 | 100 |

*Business management, general; computerization of data.

*Table 10.*

**Functions Performed by Museum Registrars**
**By Frequency of Activity and By Type of Museum**

**A. Permanent Collections**

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Accessioning and Supplying to Number Systems* | | | | | |
| All | 6.5 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 8.5 | 79.4 |
| Art | 2.9 | 2.9 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 81.9 |
| Hist | 4.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 12.8 | 78.7 |
| Comb | 10.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 8.3 | 78.3 |
| *Processing Outgoing Loans from the Collection* | | | | | |
| All | 6.9 | 11.4 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 65.0 |
| Art | 5.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 72.4 |
| Hist | 4.3 | 23.9 | 10.9 | 13.0 | 47.8 |
| Comb | 6.8 | 13.6 | 6.8 | 8.5 | 64.4 |
| *Controlling Storage Inventory* | | | | | |
| All | 3.2 | 8.4 | 14.8 | 12.8 | 60.8 |
| Art | 2.8 | 4.7 | 15.0 | 8.4 | 69.2 |
| Hist | 2.2 | 4.3 | 17.4 | 28.3 | 47.8 |
| Comb | 3.3 | 16.7 | 13.3 | 8.3 | 58.3 |
| *Cataloguing Collection Material* | | | | | |
| All | 7.2 | 6.0 | 8.4 | 19.3 | 59.0 |
| Art | 6.7 | 1.9 | 10.6 | 22.1 | 58.7 |
| Hist | 6.3 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 22.9 | 56.3 |
| Comb | 6.8 | 10.2 | 8.5 | 16.9 | 57.6 |
| *Making Arrangements for Shipping* | | | | | |
| All | 10.2 | 13.5 | 6.9 | 15.9 | 53.5 |
| Art | 1.9 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 13.2 | 76.4 |
| Hist | 19.6 | 23.9 | 10.9 | 21.7 | 23.9 |
| Comb | 11.9 | 23.7 | 10.2 | 11.9 | 42.4 |
| *Supervising Packing and Unpacking* | | | | | |
| All | 6.8 | 15.3 | 9.2 | 21.3 | 47.4 |
| Art | 2.8 | 11.3 | 7.5 | 17.9 | 60.4 |
| Hist | 10.4 | 29.2 | 14.6 | 18.8 | 27.1 |
| Comb | 6.8 | 15.3 | 11.9 | 25.4 | 40.7 |
| *Planning for Storage* | | | | | |
| Art | 6.8 | 13.5 | 13.9 | 26.7 | 39.0 |
| Art | 3.7 | 13.1 | 12.1 | 30.8 | 40.2 |
| Hist | 8.3 | 16.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Comb | 5.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 28.8 | 42.4 |

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Answering Requests for Information on Collection* | | | | | |
| All | 4.0 | 16.6 | 13.8 | 33.2 | 32.4 |
| Art | 4.7 | 10.3 | 15.0 | 30.8 | 39.3 |
| Hist | 2.1 | 27.1 | 10.4 | 35.4 | 25.0 |
| Comb | 1.7 | 18.3 | 21.7 | 31.7 | 26.7 |
| *Supplying Measurements of Objects* | | | | | |
| All | 14.5 | 26.2 | 9.3 | 20.2 | 29.8 |
| Art | 12.5 | 28.8 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 27.9 |
| Hist | 12.5 | 33.3 | 14.6 | 18.8 | 20.8 |
| Comb | 13.3 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 16.7 | 40.0 |
| *Processing Requests for Photographic Services* | | | | | |
| All | 19.4 | 23.0 | 8.9 | 22.6 | 26.2 |
| Art | 11.5 | 24.0 | 9.6 | 23.1 | 31.7 |
| Hist | 27.1 | 29.2 | 6.3 | 22.9 | 14.6 |
| Comb | 15.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 21.7 | 33.3 |
| *Inspecting Permanent Installations* | | | | | |
| All | 9.8 | 20.3 | 29.3 | 16.7 | 24.0 |
| Art | 8.7 | 15.4 | 30.8 | 19.2 | 26.0 |
| Hist | 0.4 | 25.0 | 31.3 | 12.5 | 20.8 |
| Comb | 10.2 | 23.7 | 27.1 | 13.6 | 25.4 |
| *Serving as Liaison for Visiting Scholars* | | | | | |
| All | 9.6 | 28.5 | 16.9 | 27.3 | 17.7 |
| Art | 9.4 | 26.4 | 18.9 | 30.2 | 15.1 |
| Hist | 14.6 | 31.3 | 16.7 | 25.0 | 12.5 |
| Comb | 5.1 | 30.5 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 27.1 |

**B. Temporary Exhibitions**

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Maintaining or Updating Permanent Records* | | | | | |
| All | 2.0 | 6.3 | 9.5 | 18.3 | 63.9 |
| Art | .9 | 7.5 | 12.1 | 17.8 | 61.7 |
| Hist | 2.1 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 25.5 | 61.7 |
| Comb | 1.7 | 6.7 | 11.7 | 16.7 | 63.3 |
| *Assigning to Number Systems* | | | | | |
| All | 18.0 | 8.6 | 4.1 | 8.6 | 60.7 |
| Art | 11.7 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 4.9 | 70.9 |
| Hist | 16.7 | 14.6 | 6.3 | 14.6 | 47.9 |
| Comb | 28.1 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 56.1 |

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Preparing Loan Agreements* | | | | | |
| All | 10.2 | 8.2 | 6.6 | 15.6 | 59.4 |
| Art | 6.8 | 4.9 | 2.9 | 20.4 | 65.0 |
| Hist | 12.5 | 10.4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 52.1 |
| Comb | 10.3 | 15.5 | 12.1 | 8.6 | 53.4 |
| *Arranging for Insurance Coverage* | | | | | |
| All | 21.4 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 11.1 | 54.7 |
| Art | 9.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 6.8 | 75.7 |
| Hist | 31.3 | 18.8 | 4.2 | 16.7 | 29.2 |
| Comb | 25.0 | 8.9 | 1.8 | 12.5 | 51.8 |
| *Condition Reporting* | | | | | |
| All | 9.8 | 14.2 | 6.5 | 16.3 | 53.3 |
| Art | 2.9 | 7.6 | 4.8 | 13.3 | 71.4 |
| Hist | 13.0 | 26.1 | 13.0 | 28.3 | 19.6 |
| Comb | 14.0 | 15.8 | 5.3 | 15.8 | 49.1 |
| *Making Arrangements for Shipping* | | | | | |
| All | 13.6 | 13.6 | 6.6 | 13.6 | 52.7 |
| Art | 4.9 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 14.6 | 73.8 |
| Hist | 23.4 | 27.7 | 6.4 | 14.9 | 27.7 |
| Comb | 15.8 | 19.3 | 10.5 | 7.0 | 47.4 |
| *Supervising Packing and Unpacking* | | | | | |
| All | 11.0 | 15.9 | 4.9 | 16.3 | 51.8 |
| Art | 4.8 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 16.3 | 67.3 |
| Hist | 14.6 | 29.2 | 6.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Comb | 10.5 | 21.1 | 8.8 | 14.0 | 45.6 |
| *Processing Insurance Claims* | | | | | |
| All | 29.2 | 11.7 | 4.6 | 6.7 | 47.9 |
| Art | 13.6 | 7.8 | 4.9 | 5.8 | 68.0 |
| Hist | 41.3 | 23.9 | 4.3 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
| Comb | 36.4 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 43.6 |
| *Corresponding with Donors, Leaders, Vendors* | | | | | |
| All | 3.6 | 10.1 | 12.1 | 35.9 | 38.3 |
| Art | 3.8 | 6.7 | 12.5 | 38.5 | 38.5 |
| Hist | 4.3 | 8.5 | 14.9 | 34.0 | 38.3 |
| Comb | 1.7 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 31.7 | 40.0 |
| *Inspecting Temporary Installations* | | | | | |
| All | 16.5 | 20.2 | 12.3 | 16.0 | 35.0 |
| Art | 9.8 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 16.7 | 48.0 |
| Hist | 20.8 | 27.1 | 20.8 | 16.7 | 14.6 |
| Comb | 21.1 | 21.1 | 7.0 | 17.5 | 33.3 |
| *Preparing or Redesigning Transaction Forms* | | | | | |
| All | 11.0 | 25.7 | 21.2 | 12.7 | 29.4 |
| Art | 11.7 | 21.4 | 30.1 | 11.7 | 25.3 |
| Hist | 17.0 | 23.4 | 8.5 | 21.3 | 29.8 |
| Comb | 8.6 | 27.6 | 17.2 | 8.6 | 37.9 |

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Measuring Items in Advance* | | | | | |
| All | 27.6 | 25.1 | 7.4 | 14.0 | 25.9 |
| Art | 26.5 | 22.5 | 6.9 | 12.7 | 31.4 |
| Hist | 23.4 | 34.0 | 6.4 | 17.0 | 19.1 |
| Comb | 23.9 | 23.0 | 27.8 | 23.5 | 23.8 |
| *Participating in Conferences, Workshops* | | | | | |
| All | 14.9 | 32.5 | 24.9 | 14.9 | 12.9 |
| Art | 13.5 | 34.6 | 24.0 | 14.4 | 13.5 |
| Hist | 12.5 | 29.2 | 27.1 | 14.6 | 16.7 |
| Comb | 20.3 | 25.4 | 28.8 | 15.3 | 10.2 |
| *Traveling to Coordinate Registrarial Activities* | | | | | |
| All | 33.6 | 28.3 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 10.9 |
| Art | 31.4 | 28.6 | 13.3 | 17.1 | 9.6 |
| Hist | 40.4 | 27.7 | 10.6 | 12.8 | 8.5 |
| Comb | 32.2 | 28.8 | 18.6 | 8.5 | 11.9 |

**C. General**

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Filing* | | | | | |
| All | 2.8 | 10.4 | 7.2 | 18.4 | 61.2 |
| Art | 3.8 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 13.2 | 67.0 |
| Hist | 4.3 | 8.5 | 2.1 | 23.4 | 61.7 |
| Comb | 1.7 | 16.9 | 8.5 | 22.0 | 50.8 |
| *Typing* | | | | | |
| All | 4.7 | 14.2 | 6.7 | 18.6 | 55.7 |
| Art | 4.7 | 10.3 | 6.5 | 15.0 | 63.6 |
| Hist | 4.2 | 14.6 | 8.3 | 22.9 | 50.0 |
| Comb | 6.8 | 18.6 | 6.8 | 20.3 | 47.5 |
| *Writing Reports to Director* | | | | | |
| All | 10.8 | 19.3 | 17.7 | 14.9 | 37.3 |
| Art | 9.6 | 16.3 | 22.1 | 11.5 | 40.4 |
| Hist | 8.5 | 19.1 | 14.9 | 21.3 | 36.2 |
| Comb | 15.0 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| *Conducting Research on Collection* | | | | | |
| All | 10.5 | 25.0 | 15.3 | 24.6 | 24.6 |
| Art | 10.5 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 21.9 | 26.7 |
| Hist | 10.9 | 26.1 | 19.6 | 30.4 | 13.0 |
| Comb | 3.3 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 31.7 | 23.3 |

| | % Never | % Occasionally | % Periodically | % Often | % Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Reporting Activities for Staff Information* | | | | | |
| All | 16.3 | 21.1 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 23.6 |
| Art | 9.7 | 19.4 | 24.3 | 22.3 | 24.3 |
| Hist | 17.0 | 23.4 | 12.8 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Comb | 22.0 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 13.6 | 27.1 |
| *Training Staff in Care and Handling* | | | | | |
| All | 16.3 | 27.2 | 19.5 | 19.1 | 17.9 |
| Art | 10.6 | 30.8 | 22.1 | 20.2 | 16.3 |
| Hist | 23.9 | 28.3 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 13.0 |
| Comb | 18.3 | 18.3 | 23.3 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| *Couriering* | | | | | |
| All | 21.0 | 45.0 | 12.6 | 13.9 | 7.6 |
| Art | 16.5 | 49.5 | 17.5 | 13.6 | 2.9 |
| Hist | 28.6 | 33.3 | 9.5 | 21.4 | 7.1 |
| Comb | 26.3 | 35.1 | 10.5 | 14.0 | 14.0 |

# Appendix B

# Protocol for Interview of Museum Directors by Telephone

Name
Title
Museum
Location
Telephone Number
Date
Time
Brief description of collection(s) held by museum

1. Do you have a registrar on your staff?
2. (If Yes) What function does that person perform?
   (If No) Which registrarial functions do persons on your staff perform? Who does these?
3. What qualities/characteristics (educational background, professional skills, temperament) would you seek in a registrar for your museum?
4. Which of the following topics is *most important* for mid-career professional study: "Computer Processing of Information," "Condition Reporting," "Insurance," "Packing/Shipping," or "Storage"?
5. What kind(s) of teaching/learning setting and faculty would be appropriate for mid-career level training for registrars and other museum professionals?
6. Would you have any additional comment to make on these or other aspects?

# Appendix C

# Afterscript of Video Tape
## *When the Show Moves On*

| Audio | Video | Digit Cue | Sec |
|---|---|---|---|
| MUSIC (conveying activity, pleasant, busy, *not* frantic) | Wide shot of assembled boxes, showing 77-7, FRAGILE, CUP. | | |
| | *Title over:* | | |
| | WHEN THE SHOW MOVES ON | | |
| | Medium shot of men taking large framed drawings from wall at left of screen. (Use entirely until picture has crossed front screen to left). | | |
| | *Subtitle over:* | | |
| | WHEN THE SHOW MOVES ON | | |
| | Dismantling, packing and shipping an exhibition. | | |
| WHEN PART OF A MUSEUM IS CLOSED TO VISITORS, *IMPORTANT WORK* IS GOING ON. | Stairway shot from top to bottom. | | |
| AT SUCH TIMES, MUSEUM OBJECTS NEED SPECIAL PROTECTION. | Guard at top of stairs. | | |
| MUSEUM OBJECTS ARE PARTICULARLY VULNERABLE TO DAMAGE, AND EVEN TO LOSS, WHENEVER THEY'RE BEING MOVED. | Staff member putting on white gloves. | | |
| | (Cut as hands go up screen) | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| THESE PICTURES WERE RECORDED DURING AN ACTUAL MUSEUM PROCESS WHEN A TRAVELING EXHIBITION WAS BEING DISMANTLED AND PACKED FOR SHIPMENT TO ANOTHER MUSEUM, WHERE IT WOULD BE SHOWN AGAIN. WHAT YOU'LL SEE IS AN UNREHEARSED, DOCUMENTARY REPORT OF ACTIVITIES AS THEY TOOK PLACE. | Long shots of workers bringing orange cases in and putting them in place. |
| *(No background sound on this)* | |
| MUSEUM COLLECTIONS ARE HOUSED IN ALL KINDS OF BUILDINGS. THIS ONE IS THE ANDREW CARNEGIE MANSION IN NEW YORK CITY, NOW THE HOME OF COOPER-HEWITT, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION'S NATIONAL MUSEUM OF DESIGN. | Exterior shot No. 1, panning building, showing visitor sitting on ledge at fence, stopping at entrance. |
| LIKE MANY OTHER MUSEUMS BASED IN LANDMARK STRUCTURES, COOPER-HEWITT LACKS SOPHISTICATED FACILITIES FOR SHIPPING AND RECEIVING. | (As panning continues) |
| FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN LARGE EXHIBITIONS MOVE IN AND OUT, THEY MUST PASS THROUGH THE MAIN ENTRANCE. | (As visitor is seen and camera moves toward front entrance) |
| CENTRAL PARK'S OPEN SPACE ON FIFTH AVENUE CONTRASTS SHARPLY WITH CONGESTION ON 91ST STREET, WHERE HEAVY PARKING MAKES SHIPPING NO EASY TASK. | Exterior shot No. 2, showing park greenery, street sign with zoom back to street and parked cars. |

ALTHOUGH THE MANSION APPEARS TO BE SPACIOUS, THE ACCESS IS NARROW FOR THE SHIPPING OF EXHIBITIONS.

IT WAS FOR THE REASONS THAT WE CHOSE COOPER-HEWITT — TO SHOW SOME OF THE WAYS A MUSEUM STAFF CAN "MAKE DO" AND STILL TAKE CARE.

(As camera pans exterior, ending with car passing in street)

"TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF AMERICAN ARCHITECTURAL DRAWING", A TRAVELING EXHIBITION, IS ABOUT TO LEAVE COOPER-HEWITT FOR ITS NEXT STOP AT THE JACKSONVILLE ART MUSEUM IN FLORIDA. HERE YOU SEE SOME OF ITS MORE THAN TWO HUNDRED PIECES.

Selected shots in quick-cut sequence of pieces on the walls.

(Use some from tapes of both galleries; check back on original for other selections)

THE PLANNING AND OVERSEEING OF SUCH MOVES IS PART OF A **REGISTRAR'S** JOB.

Far shot of Sheila Silverman at left of screen directing Mr. Simon on moving crate.

SHEILA SILVERMAN, ASSISTANT TO THE REGISTRAR AT COOPER-HEWITT, IS DIRECTING THIS ONE.

Closeup of Sheila directing activity.

*(Pause to bring up wild sound as Sheila speaks to Simon)*

Back to another shot continuing from previous one (ending with Sheila crossing right, saying "That's it.")

MELISSA MEIGHAN, REGISTRAR FOR THE AFA, IS ON HAND TO REPRESENT THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE ARTS AND THE ARCHITECTURAL LEAGUE OF NEW YORK, JOINT

Sheila moves toward center of screen and joins Melissa Meighan, Melissa gesturing broadly as Sheila looks at papers in her hand.

ORGANIZERS OF THE SHOW. AS YOU'LL SEE, MELISSA TAKES AN ACTIVE PART.

SHEETS OF CORRUGATED CARDBOARD JOINED WITH MASKING TAPE ARE USED TO PROTECT THE POLISHED FLOORS SO THAT A HALLWAY CAN BE PRESSED INTO SERVICE AS A TEMPORARY STAGING AND PACKING AREA.

Melissa is taping the floor covering down.

(Cut as Melissa begins to push box *directly* before a voice on wild sound asks, "Can we turn off the lights?")

BEFORE TAKING THE DRAWINGS FROM THE WALLS, SHEILA MAKES A LAST-MINUTE CHECK AGAINST THE EXHIBITION LIST.

Selected shots of Sheila doing the check. Emphasize closeups, jotting on clipboard, moving along from piece to piece.

*(Use all the wild sound that is appropriate here, except during voiceover that follows on next segment)*

Selected segments in montage effect demonstrating more in of boxes, interaction of registrars with museum staff, emphasizing the verbal directions, physical activity and weight of the boxes.

ORDINARILY, THE REGISTRAR FOR THE EXHIBITING MUSEUM HAS SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PACKING A SHOW. BECAUSE THIS IS THE FIRST MOVE ON THE TOUR, AFA AND COOPER-HEWITT ARE COLLABORATING.

Shot of Melissa looking at paper, then saying something to Sheila. Sheila shrugs and smiles.

*(Use audio as when shot. Melissa and Sheila explain what they are about to do)*

Two-shot of Melissa and Shiela standing at crates.

| | |
|---|---|
| PACKING BOXES WERE BUILT FOR THIS EXHIBITION BY THE COMPANY RESPONSIBLE FOR MOVING IT FROM MUSEUM TO MUSEUM. THEY ARE REUSABLE WOODEN UNITS THAT HAVE BEEN STORED BY THE CARRIER DURING THE SHOW, TO BE RETURNED TO THE STAGING AREA ON MOVING DAY. *(Over wild sound)* | Selected shots of boxes being brought in. |
| *(Continue wild sound)* | Overhead shot of entire room, holding until staff member walks over to the case at left screen and begins to touch one of the lag screws. |
| BEFORE EMPTY BOXES WERE SENT TO STORAGE, LAG SCREWS WERE PLACED IN THEIR HOLES AND EACH WAS GIVEN A FEW TURNS BY HAND. THIS PROCEDURE KEEPS INTERIORS CLEAN AND PREVENTS MISPLACEMENT OF PARTS DURING STORAGE. | Closeup of workers moving screws and manipulating boxes (hand shots). |
| IN EACH BOX, THE SLOTS ARE NUMBERED FOR ACCURATE PLACEMENT. ABOVE, THE EXHIBITION'S GENERAL NUMBER; BELOW, THE NUMBER FOR EACH PIECE WITH ARROWS TO SHOW HOW IT SHOULD GO INTO THE SLOT MADE TO FIT IT. | Closeup of interior section. |

EACH SLOT IS CUSHIONED WITH FELT TO ABSORB SHOCK.

WHERE NEEDED, SECTIONS ARE SUPPORTED INSIDE WITH OTHER SHOCK-PREVENTIVE MATERIALS.

Full shot of box, with pullback.

MOST OF THE DRAWINGS ARE MOUNTED BEHIND PLEXIGLASS, BUT SOME ARE UNDER GLASS. TO KEEP THEM FROM BEING DAMAGED BY SHATTERED PARTICLES, EVERY GLASS SURFACE MUST BE COVERED BY MASKING TAPE.

(Look at original tape content. If anything can be salvaged that clearly shows some of the drawings under glass, with light reflecting, include here in quick cuts. End with quick cuts of Melissa taping, being careful not to stay too long on any one action.)

MELISSA HOLDS A PARTLY FINISHED PIECE

Melissa holding frame up.

*(Background sound)*

DISMANTLING IS A STEADILY PACED AND CAUTIOUS PROCESS. THE STAFF ARE ALERT TO THE FACT THAT A QUICK, UNPLANNED MOVE COULD CAUSE SERIOUS DAMAGE.

Selected shots of men taking drawings from walls and putting them on picture cart, taking cart out into center hallway.

BECAUSE HAND-CARRYING CAN BE HAZARDOUS, IT'S GOOD PRACTICE TO USE A PICTURE TRUCK EVEN IF THE PIECES ARE MOVED ONLY A SHORT DISTANCE.

Several shots of men walking toward cart holding drawings and placing them on the cart — then moving the cart slowly across the floor.

IT'S A CAUTIOUS PROCESS, AND IN REAL TIME IT'S *DELIBERATELY* SLOWER THAN SEEN IN THESE SELECTED SHOTS.

| | |
|---|---|
| THIS PICTURE TRUCK WAS DESIGNED BY ELIZABETH BURNHAM, HEAD REGISTRAR AT COOPER-HEWITT, AND BUILT IN THE SMITHSONIAN'S SHOPS. IT'S SIMILAR TO TRUCKS USED IN OTHER MUSEUMS, BUT THIS ONE WAS SCALED DOWN TO FIT INTO COOPER-HEWITT'S ELEVATORS. | Selected shots of the truck that are especially descriptive of its function and appearance BUT not used before.<br>(A far shot, then a closer one) |
| BECAUSE THE FRAMES ARE SIMPLY DESIGNED, DRAWINGS CAN BE STACKED FACE-TO-FACE OR BACK-TO-BACK IN FRAME-TO-FRAME CONTACT WITHOUT RISK OF DAMAGE. OTHERWISE, SEPARATORS WOULD BE USED. | Closeup of white-gloved hands stacking on cart, followed by medium shot of pictures stacked in truck. |
| FOR A SHORT TRUCKING LIKE THIS, LARGE PIECES STACKED LENGTHWISE CAN BE KEPT FROM FALLING BY THE USE OF A ROPE. IF THE TRUCK WERE TO HAVE FURTHER TO GO, IT WOULD BE WELL TO PAD THE CORNERS TO AVOID ABRASION BY THE ROPE ITSELF. OFTEN, ONE SAFEGUARD CAN CREATE ANOTHER KIND OF DAMAGE. | Closeup of hands tying rope at side, cut to shot of rope around cart, moving across screen. |
| *(Wild sound as appropriate)* | Workers bringing truck to center of screen; Melissa and Sheila are beginning to check items against lists to see where they go in packing cases. Find a shot that shows them *moving toward a case.* |
| EACH SLOT IS BUILT TO FIT A PARTICULAR DRAWING WITH AN IDENTIFICATION NUMBER SHOWN | View of packing case showing numbers.<br>(If too short for narration, cut to other shots of case interiors, |

| | |
|---|---|
| ABOVE. LOCATIONS FOR ALL ITEMS ARE RECORDED ON THE LISTS, BUT SOME SLOTS HAVE TO BE NUMBERED BY HAND DURING THE CHECK. | 3 shots, especially the one with pullback)<br>(There is ONE brief shot where Sheila numbers a slot with a pencil. If this can coincide, GOOD) |
| *(As recorded, with Sheila's instructions about which way one of the pieces should face.)* | Sheila stooping down to tell a worker where to put something. |
| *(Sound as recorded)* | Similar shots to convey continued process. |
| ONCE THE DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN PUT IN THE COMPARTMENTS, EACH BOX IS CLOSED FIRMLY. LAG SCREWS ARE USED RATHER THAN SLOTTED OR PHILLIPS HEAD, BECAUSE THEY HOLD UP BETTER UNDER REPEATED INSERTION AND REMOVAL. A NUT DRIVER IS BEING USED HERE. | Mr. Simon putting cover on case, inserting lag screws and driving them home. |
| ONCE TIGHTLY CLOSED, THE BOXES ARE READY TO LEAVE THE MUSEUM. | Santini men taking cases out and loading them into elevator. |
| *(Wild sound under)* | (CUT OUT THE SMILE OF THE WORKER INTO CAMERA) |
| BECAUSE THERE IS NO FREIGHT ELEVATOR AT COOPER-HEWITT, THE MAIN ELEVATOR MUST BE USED TO TRANSPORT THE BOXES TO STREET LEVEL. | |
| *(Wild sound under)* | |
| RESERVING A SPACE FOR THE TRUCK TAKES SOME RESOURCEFULNESS. | Find a shot of trash basket in original tapes and insert here. |

| | |
|---|---|
| AS YOU SAW, THE ENTRANCE IS USED AS THE LOADING DOCK. FOR THIS MOVE, A SPECIAL RAMP HAS BEEN PLACED OVER THE MAIN STAIRS. | Suitable shots showing the main entrance without and with the wooden tracks in place. |
| *(Wild sound under)* | Shots of Santini men bringing the cases out on dollies, running them up on the truck lift. |
| BELTING IS FOR A SHORT HAUL TO THE WAREHOUSE — ON A LATER MOVE, EVERYTHING WILL BE BLANKETED FOR THE LONG MOVE TO FLORIDA. | Shot showing belting process. |
| BETWEEN MUSEUMS, MOVING AN EXHIBITION IS THE CARRIER'S RESPONSIBILITY. GETTING IT IN AND OUT OF THE MUSEUMS WILL BE UP TO THE REGISTRAR IN EACH LOCATION. | Shot showing double doors being closed. Driver getting into cab and moving. (Include Santini and Hertz labels) |
| THE EXHIBITION WILL BE UNPACKED, SHOWN, DISMANTLED AND PACKED MANY TIMES BEFORE IT COMES BACK TO NEW YORK. THE BUILDINGS WILL BE DIFFERENT, THE PROBLEMS WILL BE DIFFERENT, BUT THE REGISTRAR'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES WILL BE MUCH THE SAME. AT EACH LOCATION IT WILL BE A MATTER OF REALISTIC MANAGEMENT AND SENSIBLE CARE. | |

*(Fade music up as used at beginning. Continue under crawl and assorted shots.)*

Over crawl, quick cuts of the following:
(Choose order according to crawl, allowing some pause between credits)
Sheila and men busy shot
Melissa and Sheila busy shot
Melissa closeup
Sheila closeup
Removing piece from wall
Long shot of cases in room
Side of case
Cart
Open packing case
Hand closeups
Hands with gloves
Coming out
Driver entering cab
Entrance alone
Entrance with trash container

(Mix above according to timing, effect)

NARRATOR

Philip Leslie
Registrar
The Smithsonian Institution

APPEARING ON CAMERA
(in alphabetical order)

James Bracey
Miguel Bonilla
George Gassett
Bingley Jones
Michael McClaron
Melissa Meighan
Salvatore Papa
Sheila Silverman
Alfred Simon
Vincent Salierno

WRITERS

Elizabeth Burnham
Marjorie Hoachlander
Philip Leslie

122

EXECUTIVE PRODUCER

Marjorie Hoachlander
Director of Museum Studies
Center for Advanced Study
in Education
City University of New York

REGISTRAR ASSOCIATE

Elizabeth Burnham
Registrar
The Cooper-Hewitt
National Museum of Design

PRODUCERS

Claude Beller
Stefan Moore

TVG PRODUCTIONS

Super CASE Report VTR 07-78
over shot of box showing
FRAGILE, CUP

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN MADE POSSIBLE THROUGH GRANTS FROM THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND THE WILLIAM H. DONNER FOUNDATION, WITH ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM HUNTINGTON T. BLOCK. WE WISH ALSO TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE COOPERATION OF COOPER-HEWITT, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION'S NATIONAL MUSEUM OF DESIGN, AND THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS IN PERMITTING ACTUAL PROCEDURES TO BE RECORDED ON VIDEO TAPE.

123

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Marjorie E. Hoachlander is an educational technologist who serves as a research and development consultant to libraries, museums and universities. She is President of Uses, Incorporated, an organization directed toward widening the use of film and television for learning. Dr. Hoachlander holds a Ph.D. in Education (Administration/Curriculum Development) from The University of Maryland and an M.A. in Communications from New York University.

Throughout most of her adult life, the author has been closely associated with museum practices as a docent, volunteer and collector. An active member of the American Association of Museums, she has contributed articles to *Museum News* and conducted a nationwide search for films and videotapes produced by museums.

One of Dr. Hoachlander's current projects is an investigation of how satellite transmission could assist museums in reaching new audiences and sharing computerized data.

## ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Academy for Educational Development is an independent, nonprofit, tax-exempt organization, founded in 1961 to help colleges and universities solve long-range educational, administrative, and financial problems. Since then, the scope of its activities has expanded greatly, dealing with a wide range of concerns to society.

Today, the Academy is providing services in formal education from the primary grades through graduate study; in life-long education, including nonformal learning and vocational training; in communications as an art and as an increasingly important form of technology; and in international affairs, where it assists developing countries in planning, operating, and evaluating educational and community development programs designed to improve the social and economic well-being of their citizens.

In recent years, the Academy has received funds from several major foundations to study issues that have significant social implications—including the impact of government programs on the American family, major transitions in the human life course, ideas for dealing with energy shortages, ways of enhancing life-long learning aspirations, and efforts to encourage older adults to remain active participants in American life.